INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VIII., No. 7. (NEW SERIES.) JULY, 1897. Subscription, Post Free. SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	193
Lord Roberts's Second Thoughts, by J. Dacosta ..	199
The Indian Budget, by D. E. Wacha	202
Land Revenue Settlement in Madras, by G. Subramania Iyer	204
"Conciliation or Litigation"	206
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects ..	208
Recent Official Publications	208
Some Lessons of the Famine	209
Alexander the Great	211
Indian Delegates in England: Important Campaign in the Constituencies	212
Lord G. Hamilton and the Indian Delegates	216
India and the "Diamond Jubilee"	218
Anglo-Muhammadan Law	220
A Strong-Minded Hindu. II., by W. Martin Wood ..	221
Correspondence: "The Ancient Monuments of India" ..	223

Indiana.

The "Diamond Jubilee."

FAMINE, plague, earthquake, and an impending renewal of war in Waziristan might have been expected to attract public attention to India in the midst of the recent "Jubilee" celebrations. While the rest of the British Empire, except Ireland, rejoices, India is plunged in mourning. Yet the British Government and the British public apparently see no reason to turn aside for a moment from the "perpetual cataract of congratulation" in order to pay heed to the claims put forward by Indian public opinion, and to grant some slight concession which might serve to render the year notable in Indian annals for something besides an appalling series of calamities. The suggestions made by Indians resident in the United Kingdom in their address to her Majesty the Queen, and by Sir W. Wedderburn in his letter to the *Times*, have, so far as one can see, produced no practical result whatever. And while no steps were taken to secure an adequate representation of India at the "Jubilee" celebrations themselves, even the guests that came were treated in a way which, compared, for example, with the honours done (and rightly done) to the Colonial Premiers, can hardly be regarded as creditable. Yet public opinion at home is by no means free from apprehension with regard to India—as witness the significant, though absurd, readiness to assume a political basis for every supposed symptom of unrest, whether it be smearing of mango trees or an act of fanaticism like the deplorable assassination of Lieutenant Ayerst.

Sir M. M. Bhownaggree, K.C.I.E.

THE news that Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji has secured the distinction of K.C.I.E. for Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree will hardly have excited much surprise in India. Something of the sort was fully expected, and had been more than once foreshadowed in our columns. We say that the distinction is ultimately due to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji because, of course, nobody in his senses imagines that Anglo-Indian Toryism would have been at the pains to introduce Mr. Bhownaggree to public notice, if it had not been thought necessary to provide a counterblast, however feeble, to the inconvenient contentions which Mr. Naoroji has put forward with untiring industry and with so much success. When the Primrose League regales a free and independent electorate with tea and strawberries and brass bands, the intelligent observer attributes the hospitality not, of course, to the party which the Primrose League serves, but to the party which armed the electorate with the franchise. The victims of the hospitality are none the less to be pitied, and nobody, we imagine, will envy the agent of the India Office the badge which he has obtained. Sir Wilfrid Lawson has made the cruel suggestion that reasons should be stated when public decorations are conferred. It would be superfluous to enquire what are the services which have been recognised in the case of Mr. Bhownaggree. One cannot recognise what does

not exist. Was it not Lord Melbourne who said that he liked the Garter because it was not mixed up with any damned nonsense about merit? The India Office has merely confessed its obligations, and shown its hand. Fortunately no Congress-wallah need apply when decorations are being given away. The purity of the Congress party is not menaced by these temptations. If anything were needed to persuade lovers of their country of the vanity of titles, this latest escapade would suffice to do it. Let us admit, however, that the Tories, whatever else may be said or thought of them, are not afraid to reward (even at the risk of ridicule) those whom they see to be with them. But what is one to think of the unspeakable stupidity which in the last Parliament prevented Liberals in office from conciliating the great body of public opinion in India? The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. Need it be added that they are immeasurably wiser than some Liberal Secretaries of State?

The Indian Budget.

A perusal of the text of Sir James Westland's financial statement only serves to confirm the views we had occasion to express on the telegraphic summary of it in our April number. In view of the forthcoming discussion in the House, however, there are one or two points that invite further remark, partly by way of insistence, partly by way of expansion—notably the famine and the question of the provincial contracts. Meantime a believer in portents might well regard the outlook as ominous. Upon the famine and the plague there has followed an earthquake, causing widespread destruction and dislocation. Border troubles have been renewed by an outbreak of "tribal treachery," provoked of course by insensate aggressiveness. Why, in the name of sense and reason, should we parade our troops in the face of the untamed tribesmen of the frontier? What else can be expected from them? What, especially, can a nation that prides itself on liberty and independence expect from mountaineers that have never known actual subjection? Anyhow, here we are again fitting out a punitive expedition to chastise the recalcitrant tribesmen of the Tochi valley. So the vicious circle goes round, and the charges accumulate on the distressed exchequer at Calcutta. And meantime, also, there is the incredible folly of neglecting to invite any single native Indian prince to take part in his public capacity in the Jubilee celebrations in London. It is the acme of political fatuity.

Militarism and the Famine.

There is at least one cause for qualified satisfaction in connexion with the famine, and that is the general feeling that, in spite of its unparalleled area, it has, on the whole, been tackled with more efficiency and success than were displayed in the case of former visitations. When all has been said that ought to be said against the preliminary obstructions, hesitations, and unreadiness of officialism, this result ought to be liberally acknowledged. There will probably be little disposition to haggle with the Indian Government over the expenditure. The important thing, undoubtedly, is that the lesson should be laid to heart frankly; and the main ground of censure—so far as one can see at present—lies in the Government's limited attention to the means of prevention that were amply set before it, not merely by obnoxious critics, but in the report of the last Famine Commission. We have already expressed approval of the expansion of the railway system, in so far as it practically meets the necessities of relief in a time of scarcity or famine; although we do at the same time question gravely the expediency of railway building even for commercial or social convenience, beyond the immediately available resources of the treasury or of the country. The irrigation system, in a financial point of view, has proved very discouraging, it must be admitted. Yet it is quite an essential part of the preventive organisation, and should be judiciously extended in the future. On both these sides there is something to the credit of the Government. On the other hand, there are points, apparently of the most obviously fundamental nature, that the Government had neglected lamentably, and with deplorable results. The main reason for such neglect is on the surface; it is the essential reason of the financial difficulty—the insane military expenditure, especially on frontier expeditions, which has kept the treasury in a chronic state of depletion The first line of defence against famine is the ability of the peasant to stand the initial shock—to hold out till the official machinery of organisation can work up to his relief and support. The Famine Commissioners recognised this pretty evident fact. Among the grounds of hope for the future mitigation of famines, they expressly mentioned "that greater preparedness of the people to meet them which grows from the increase of thrift and resourcefulness, and the accumulation of capital due to a settled and civilised Government." But the Government is lacking in the last-mentioned quality; it still lags in the military stage; it is an age behind the times. It is true that the poorest of the people are not directly taxed, except for salt, in order to support the military extravagance of the Government; but, as we have over and over again pointed out, the strain reaches them indirectly. The Famine Commissioners expected "the cultivators and landlords to do something towards the improvement of their land, but mainly in their own traditional way, which mostly takes the form of

sinking wells, planting mango and other fruit trees, making tanks and reclaiming waste land." The expectation is wholly reasonable. Yet it is all but hopeless. The rayat is totally unprovided with the necessary means, and the landlord is in too many cases unable to assist him. There is no lack of knowledge or of good intention; the difficulty is the absence of the "wherewithal." What, then, can the Government do? That, too, we have reiterated to weariness. We have pointed out the vicious working of the revenue system, with its inappropriate and cast-iron formality and its unreasonable and inexorable demands. We have grieved over the persistent determination exerted by the Government to keep the agricultural community irrevocably in the legal grasp of the village usurer in which it has miserably thrown him. Nor does any sensible relief come to agriculture through the development of industries. Nay, the very industries of the country are unhesitatingly cramped, handicapped and disorganised whenever Lancashire cotton chooses to exclaim at the competition of the Bombay mills. The way out of the quagmire is plain. Reduce expenditure, and especially military expenditure, with trenchant firmness; accommodate the revenue and taxation to the circumstances and ways of the people; make agricultural banks take the place of the *sowkar* and all his works; and foster external commerce as well as internal industries. Otherwise the Government must continue to flounder in the Slough of Despond, which means that the permanence of the Empire, as well as its prestige, remains exposed to gratuitous danger. We can, indeed, but deliver our own soul; we cannot even hope that a Government that now embarks on wild railway expansion on the one hand, and reckless Indian and English loans on the other, piling up the crushing load of Indian indebtedness on a basis of chimerical hopes continuously belied by the perversity of events, will turn its ear to the counsels of prudence, even in the interests of national prosperity, to say nothing of national preservation.

The Provincial Contracts.

THE question of provincial contracts must now be regarded as having entered on a serious practical stage. It has become a point of urgent administrative importance. In the Legislative Council, Mr. Sayani passed a series of criticisms that deserve the closest attention, and that none the less because he gave them judiciously restrained and tentative expression. The system, he said,

> "cannot conduce to economy in financial administration, nor favour the progress of internal deve[illegible]pment or administrative improvement."

If this be true, then it is th[illegible]ondemnation of the system. Now, what wer[illegible]points of inefficiency that Mr. Sayani had in his mind when he uttered this condemnation? They were—

> "Unequal and unfair apportionments between Imperial and local needs on the one hand, and as between one province and another on the other—a standing source of irritation and discontent in itself—short-term settlements not calculated to inspire a sense of security or certainty, periodical re-adjustments of assignments generally resulting in curtailment of provincial resources and impairing the continuity of provincial work, extraordinary provincial contributions levied apparently without convincing reason or clearly demonstrated necessity: these are some of the features of the system, and there is no wonder that they reduce its value, and in its practical working do not show it to much advantage."

The system, instead of being a source of strength, local, and therefore imperial, operates, in fact, as a deplorable cause of weakness and waste. Responsibilities are placed upon the provinces, and the provinces never know the day when their projects may be thwarted or paralyzed. When they have got the money in hand, they are sorely tempted to hurry its expenditure on their own undertakings before the mandate to deliver it up comes down upon them from Calcutta. There can be but little wonder if there be heartburnings in Bombay and Madras when the local provision for local needs is suddenly appropriated to be poured through the military sieve on the barren mountains beyond the North-West Frontier. If there is any country in the world where it is vital at the present moment to promote internal improvements, that country is India. And yet there the central Government takes to itself about two-thirds of the revenues—a far larger proportion than in any other country—and effectually hampers the ordinary local administration. Besides, the meagre and grossly inadequate provincial assignments are, as Mr. Sayani properly points out, "liable to curtailment on periodical revision, which introduces an element of uncertainty calculated to paralyze all solid advance, and was not contemplated in the original scheme." Why, then, should the provincial authorities worry their life out in penuriously economical management? How is it possible that their proper work—the work for which they are responsible—should proceed with the continuity necessary for prosperous development? The central Government must, of course, go on; and its difficulties constitute the measure of provincial embarrassment and neutrality. Mr. Sayani proposes a dilemma:

> "Now, the embarrassments of the central exchequer can only be either permanent or temporary in their nature. If permanent, let there be a permanent readjustment; if temporary, let there be a temporary contribution; but surely there is no justification for revision, or, in other words, asking more and more, at regular intervals—it takes away all elements of permanence and fixity."

In any case, the short-term settlements are deprecated even by some of the most experienced and

distinguished official members, past as well as present, of the Viceroy's Council. A survey of the working of the system during the past quarter of a century cannot leave any doubts in any reasonable and independent mind that it is a grievous hindrance to the natural progress of provincial development, and therefore an imperial mistake. And so, once more, we are brought back to the perennial source of the whole mischief—the extravagant expenditure of the central authorities on their unprofitable military policy. It is more than time for the House of Commons to address itself seriously to the consideration of these fundamental questions of Indian government and imperial prosperity and safety.

A "Frontier Incident."

The public at home was startled on June 11th by a Simla telegram announcing "Disaster to an Indian frontier force; British officers killed and wounded." The "contents-bills" of some of the evening newspapers in London and the country improved the occasion with such wanton and pernicious nonsense as "Rising *in* India," "British Disaster *in* India," and "Treacherous attack by Natives." One subsequently learned that a force escorting a political officer who was deputed to fix a site for a military post in the Tochi valley on the road to Ghazni had been attacked by local tribesmen, decimated, and pursued for four miles until it was relieved from Datta Khel, the post whence it had started. "No reason can be assigned for this sudden outbreak except the return of a fanatical priest." So one read in the *Times* of June 12th. But the reason seems obvious when one considers that the force was invading far beyond the frontier, tribal territory which it had no right to enter and whence we had repeatedly been warned off by the attitude of the inhabitants. Our dealings with Afghans for sixty years (at the expense of the Indian taxpayers) have long since made us acquainted with their determination to keep the territory free from the domination of any *Kafir* or infidel Power, and with their readiness to lay down their lives in fighting for their ancient independence and their faith. It seems incredible, therefore, that those who planned the invasion should have deluded themselves into the belief that the tribesmen would forbear opposing our attempt to fortify ourselves in their territory. It is possible, of course, that the incursion was intended to provoke war. If so, it has served its purpose, for orders have been issued for a larger force, under Major General Corrie Bird, to invade the Tochi valley forthwith, and probably also to establish further posts on the road to Ghazni, the goal of the enterprise. Meanwhile, as war appears certain, it may be of interest to review the events which have led to the present situation.

The Waziristan "Deal."

The Darwesh Khel Waziris who are said to have attacked the British force in the Tochi valley belong to a numerous clan, a section of which, the Kabul Khel Waziris, occupy a territory to the North of the valley, and another section, the Mahsud Waziris, dwell in the Zhob country some miles to the South. In 1880 we unsuccessfully attempted to subjugate the former, and in 1888 we strove to bring the latter under our control, intending to construct a railway through their territory in order to connect our frontier station of Dehra Ismail Khan through the Gumal Pass with Pishin. The column sent in 1888 to survey that pass was, however, hindered from accomplishing its mission by tribesmen from Makin. And when, in the following year, a considerable force advanced from Baluchistan for the same purpose, it was arrested by the Kiddarzai tribe. In 1890, however, the late Sir R. Sandeman entered into negotiations with chiefs in the Zhob country and was allowed, in consideration of annual subsidies guaranteed to them, to establish a post at Apozai which was subsequently named Fort Sandeman. He induced at the same time the Mahsud Waziris and other local tribes to keep the Gumal Pass open for trade with India on condition of their being annually paid certain subsidies by the Government. But when the tribes perceived that we were fortifying ourselves at Apozai, and using the Gumal Pass for bringing additional military forces into the Zhob valley, they repudiated the bargain accepted by the local chiefs without their concurrence, and started a series of attacks on our post by night-firing into our camp, cutting off our soldiers when they strayed from their lines, plundering our convoys and harassing our communications with India. When we complained of these annoyances to the Amír and represented them in the light of hostilities committed on British soil, he enquired in his reply as to the exact boundary of our Indian Empire, obviously implying that our grievances were the result of our own encroachment upon independent tribal territory. At the same time he complied with our request that an officer of his who was stationed in Waziristan should be recalled. The Waziris nevertheless continued their attacks, a circumstance which we attributed to influence exercised by the Amír himself, and it was thereupon sought to intimidate him by a threat (published in the *Times* of November 20, 1892) to the effect that we should annihilate his kingdom unless he fell in with our settled frontier policy. The step, however, having produced no tangible result, we ultimately arranged for a conference in his capital at [illegible]ch we contended that the Eastern border tribes of Afghanistan were not his subjects as they paid him [illegible] revenue and were ruled by their own elected *malik*[illegible] we agreed to increase the

subsidy of 1,200,000 rupees which he was receiving from India to 1,800,000 rupees, provided that he undertook to abstain from giving material assistance to any border tribe who resisted the introduction of British rule in their territory. These terms were accepted by him. And as we also contended that his kingdom did not extend to India, but lay beyond the border lands, he consented to a joint Commission being appointed by him and ourselves for demarcating the boundary line which, according to our view, separates his kingdom from the territories of the independent border tribes.

An Insincere Contention.

THE theory propounded by us is, however, inconsistent and irreconcileable with the laws and customs prevailing in Afghanistan, where the tribes of the country are all united by a general compact binding each to keep the land of Islam free from the *kafir*, or infidel, and to join in a *jehad*, or religious war undertaken for the expulsion of the *kafirs*. Much of this was revealed to us in papers which we succeeded in intercepting, including a letter addressed to tribal leaders by the Amír himself, in which it was said:—

"God has imposed *jehad* on all believers, and whoever shall deny this shall be a *kafir*. You should fight the *kafirs* who come into your land. Fear not death. All believers should join in *jehad*; they should not, like women, sit in their houses, but, like men, become *ghazis* (martyrs) in the cause. True Moslems should hasten to the frontier which it is their duty to guard and protect, preventing *kafirs* from entering the land of Islam. We call on all inhabitants of cities and villages to support the religion of Islam by prayer, by fasts, and by war. The frontiers of the territory of Islam have fallen into the power of oppressors. All believers are bound to join in *jehad* when they are called to arms. By the grace of God they should do their utmost to uphold the religion of Mahomed. Let them go forth to war, and like tigers meet the host of unbelievers. Let them mow down with their swords that pernicious body, and use their heads like bulls."

With a knowledge of these facts it seems childish, if not insincere, to contend that the tribesmen of the Tochi valley had no reason to oppose the force which invaded their territory last month. And as the road which we are endeavouring to open through that valley leads to the heart of the Amír's kingdom, we may possibly find ourselves before long engaged in a third Afghan war unless peaceable means be again found for escaping from difficulties brought on by our own action.

Work in the Constituencies.

ELSEWHERE in this issue will be found some account of the series of meetings which, under arrangements made by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, have recently been addressed by the Indian gentlemen selected to give evidence before Lord Welby's Commission. The importance of the work which has thus been done by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor G. K. Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer cannot be over-estimated. Speakers and writers on Indian questions are sometimes a little apt to assume that British opinion at home coincides with the less generous views of Anglo-Indian bureaucrats. Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth. An average audience of British electors is never appealed to in vain on the broad grounds of justice, equal dealing, and fidelity to pledges, and to carry the case of India to the tribunal of the British constituencies is to be secure, at any rate, of a sympathetic hearing. It happened, by an unfortunate coincidence, that the Indian speakers in the recent campaign set out under exceptionally discouraging circumstances. The time of the year was unfavourable, and there was much other excitement to distract public attention. But the conspicuous success which they everywhere achieved under these trying conditions affords the best guarantee for the future. For of course it need hardly be said that it will be the duty of all concerned to follow up in a vigorous campaign the advantages which have been gained. To supply information to members of Parliament is not enough. Efforts of that kind, as the British Committee has always recognised, need to be supplemented by direct appeals to the constituencies themselves, and in this work the co-operation of Indian speakers, whose knowledge is at first hand, and whose success in addressing audiences is proverbial, cannot be valued too highly. If the time at the disposal of Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Mr. Wacha, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer had been longer, more meetings could have been arranged for them. As it was we believe that they found their time and energy fully engaged. The thanks of their fellow-countrymen throughout India are due to them for their public-spirited labours at a time when most visitors to England have found occupation for their leisure in very different directions.

The Plan of Campaign.

As an example of the results achieved by this campaign in the constituencies it may be interesting to quote the remarks of the *Sunderland Daily Echo* upon the meeting addressed at Sunderland on May 19th by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea:

"The meeting at the Liberal Club last night to hear the Indian representatives was very successful. The speeches of the visitors were clear and forcible, and in one case eloquent. They pleaded for Home Rule for India. It will be a long time before public opinion in this country is brought to that point, but there could be no better means of hastening the day than such visits and such speeches. No one could imagine for a moment that the Indian visitors last night were inferior in grasp of political subjects to Englishmen of the best class. With leaders of so high a type the Indian people must eventually be a self-governing race."

Similarly the meeting at Hastings on May 26th passed a resolution rejoicing "in the existence of the Indian National Congress" and believing "in the wisdom of conferring larger representative powers upon the people of our greatest dependency." It should be added that the Indian delegates were on more than one occasion supported by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. J. P. Goodridge, Mr. H. N. Haridas and others. Mr. Haridas, indeed, in his work in mid-Derbyshire during the past three years has set an example which other Indians might with advantage follow. Lord Rosebery said some time ago that the best way to fight a constituency was to get to know every man, woman and child in it. That is what Mr. Haridas appears to have done in Belper. He has won his way not only to the heads but also to the hearts of the people, and nobody who reads the account of the interesting farewell meeting at which his numerous friends presented him with a token of their esteem can doubt the sincerity of the feelings he has inspired. One result of Mr. Haridas's work is that the member for the division, Mr. J. A. Jacoby, has pledged himself, both in his election address and in speeches, to support all reasonable reforms for India. Mr. John Smedley, of Belper, to whose good offices Mr. Haridas's opportunities have been largely due, writes to us as follows:—

"I must bear my testimony to the very great interest, and devotion, which Mr. Haridas has unceasingly brought to bear on this question of Indian reform during his sojourn in this country. He is richly deserving of the best thanks of all true Indian reformers. The Congress Committee in London are doing a good and useful work, but I think it might be extended to the provinces with good results, and gentlemen in various parts of the country, who are known to be interested, invited to join the committee and to attend special meetings, say once a quarter. It might be well also to hold a conference in one of the provincial towns once a year, changing the place every year, to which interested ladies and gentlemen might be invited. By this means the democracy of England would become informed. And as it is the intention of our Indian friends to come over in strong force, with a contingent of their best platform men, to hold an Indian National Congress in London as soon as possible, this would prepare the way, and when they come over we should have an organisation at work which would make it easy to arrange for public meetings all over the country. Since so much has been done in Mid-Derbyshire by Mr. Haridas, many other constituencies could be captured, and by this means substantial progress made. For it is in this country that the battle has to be fought, and the sooner this fact is realised both in India and in England the better."

How India is "Bled." THE Indian Trade and Navigation Returns for the month of March, which give the totals of the sea-borne Trade of India for the year ending 31st of that month, have tardily come to hand. The extent of the area from which the items have to be collected unavoidably causes delay in the adjustment in the final month of the year's record. The aggregate commercial transactions of India with all other seafaring nations for the year 1896-7 are here given, together with those of the two years preceding for comparison. We present them in Rx.:—

	1896-7	1895-6	1894-5
EXPORTS:	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Merchandise ..	103,983,618	114,334,738	108,913,778
Treasure	4,937,495	4,259,810	8,226,071
	108.921.113	118.594.548	117.139.849

	1896-7	1895-6	1894-5
IMPORTS:	Rx.	Rx.	Rx.
Merchandise ..	76,215,835	72,936,752	73,528,992
Treasure	13,084,563	13,367,987	9,581,207
	89,300,398	86.304,739	83,110,199
INDIA'S COMMERCIAL DEFICIT ..	Rx. 19,620,715	32,289,809	34,029,650

It will be seen that while the aggregate trade of the year only fell below that of 1895-6 by rather more than 6 per cent. (667 lakhs) there were great differences in the proportion of exports and imports: the former fell off by 967 lakhs, while imports exceeded those of 1895-6 by nearly 300 lakhs. If it be asked where the effects of the famine came in, that can be answered by referring to the figures as they stood at the end of September last, at the end of the half-year. At that period the imports were much in excess of the previous year, cotton goods having been largely taken while the exports had fallen only by a small percentage, chiefly in wheat. But, as everybody knows, with October came failure of crops over a large part of India, and poverty checked demand for imported goods. But it may be remarked that the net import of bullion was little less than in the preceding year, and very much larger than in 1894-5. And in a certain demi-official notice this apparent anomaly is thus spoken of: "it is remarkable that India should be able to take off over eight crores' worth of the precious metals during a period when trade was depressed and millions of people have been suffering from scarcity of food and famine." It was also remarked that, the mints being closed, gold and silver could only be regarded as commodities in British India, while very little was being coined in the Native States. Certainly, we have here one of those things of India which are not quite plain even to the usually well-informed official mind. Let us assist it if we can. First, let it be noted that eighty millions of rupees amongst the nearly 300 millions of India gives little more than four annas, say sixpence a head. And of this it is tolerably certain a somewhat larger share would be taken by the sixty-six millions in the Native States. This simple arithmetical test of India's absorption of the precious metals is habitually overlooked. Then it is obvious that, as merchants and native distributors of cotton goods and other imports of European produce would see at once in October that demand would largely fall off, they would import bullion instead. For, though the mints would not coin for them, gold and silver bars would suffice to adjust their current balances and maintain their reserves. And when it is noticed that Indian imports of bullion in 1894-5 were very small, less than one million Rx., there seems nothing very "remarkable" in the eight crores importation of last year. What is really "remarkable" as compared with other nations of the earth, and an anomaly that runs through all statements of the results of India's foreign trade, is, as shown above, that in the three years her commercial outgoings have exceeded her incomings by the enormous sum of Rx. 85,941,174. The marvel is, not that India is impoverished, but that the masses of her people can live at all.

LORD ROBERTS'S SECOND THOUGHTS.

By J. DACOSTA.

Lord Roberts's book has now been read by thousands of persons, and has doubtless imparted to many of them more accurate notions of the people and circumstances of India than they previously entertained. His lordship's graphic description of stirring events in the mutinies and rebellion of 1857-59—the ruthless massacre of Englishmen and Englishwomen, the sudden destruction of British rule in Upper India and its ultimate restoration through the heroic action of British officers and the fidelity of Natives—cannot be perused without thrilling interest being awakened in the reader.

Other events of equal interest occurred during the period to which the book relates—the Afghan war of 1878-80 and the minor wars undertaken for the subjugation of our tribal neighbours on the North and North-West of India. These wars were entered upon in pursuance of a frontier policy which certain influential statesmen at home adopted in 1876 on the plea that a military occupation of Afghanistan was necessary for securing our Indian possessions against an invasion from Russia. The Prime Minister created, however, considerable surprise, when inaugurating that policy in November, 1878, by denying the imminence of a Russian invasion and declaring that the policy simply aimed at acquiring a scientific frontier which could be defended at a considerably smaller cost than the frontier we actually possessed.

> "So far as the invasion of India in that quarter is concerned," added Lord Beaconsfield, "it is the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that it is hardly practicable. The base of operations of any possible foe is so remote, the communications so difficult, the aspect of the country so forbidding, that we have long arrived at the opinion that an invasion of our Empire by passing the mountains which form our North-West frontier is one which we need not dread."

The inauguration of a war policy on the inconsistent plea of reducing military expenditure created mistrust and doubts as to the real aim of the Cabinet, and when the war undertaken for its execution came to a disastrous end, popular indignation at home brought about the immediate downfall of the Ministry.

Lord Roberts, having taken a prominent part in the war, had full opportunities of forming a correct judgment on the policy best calculated to secure the N.-W. frontier of India, and he recorded his opinion on the subject in a despatch, dated from Kabul, the 29th May, 1880, in which, referring to the apprehended advance of a Russian Army through Afghanistan he said :—

> "The longer and more difficult the line of communication is, the more numerous and greater the obstacles which Russia should have to overcome ; and so far from shortening one mile of the road, I would let the web of difficulties extend to the very mouth of the Khyber Pass. Should Russia in future years attempt to conquer Afghanistan or invade India through it, we should have a better chance of attaching the Afghans to our interests, if we avoid all interference with them in the meantime."

This opinion substantially coincides with the opinion expressed by the high authorities who were consulted in the matter in 1866-67. Lord Lawrence and his Council said in their collective reply to the Secretary of State :—

> "We think it impolitic and unwise to decrease any of the difficulties which would be entailed on Russia, if that country thought of invading India, as we should certainly decrease them if we left our frontier and met her half way, in a difficult country and possibly in the midst of a hostile and exasperated population. We see no limit to the expenditure which such a move might require. Should Russia ever think of invading India, our strongest security would be found in our previous abstinence from all entanglements at Kabul or Kandahar, or any similar outpost, in full reliance on a compact army within our territories or on our border."

The Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's Forces in India, in a minute which accompanied the despatch, observed :—

> "As a military and vast political power, we have literally nothing to fear from Russia, whether she stop at her present limits or spread her power, even to our own borders. A great mischief is done by those, from whatever cause, occupy themselves in preaching the falsehood of our weakness in India. We are simply invincible in that country against all the powers in the world, provided we are true to ourselves."

These views were formed on the experience of our first Afghan war, and when they were confirmed by Lord Roberts's despatch basedon the experience of our second Afghan war, the "scientific frontier" policy stood universally condemned, and was abandoned by the Government. In 1885, however, when the originators of that policy were returned to power on the Irish Home Rule question, they endeavoured to vindicate their unsuccessful war administration through fresh attempts to execute their unfortunate frontier policy. The Indian army was at once materially increased on the revived plea of danger from Russian ambition, and expeditions were organised to subjugate the border-tribes of Afghanistan and construct military roads through their territories, so that communications with India might be faciliated when a British army again entered the Afghan kingdom. These trans-frontier expeditions, however, were not more successful than the war of 1878-80 had been. The tribes were not subjugated, nor were the military roads made ; and the renewed attempts to execute the "scientic frontier" policy have thus far resulted only in continued bloodshed, in the complete alienation of our neighbours and in a heavy addition to the public debt of India.

Reverting now to Lord Roberts's book, the following passage, which indicates an entire change of opinion in his lordship's mind since May, 1880, and expresses an admiring acquiescence in the wisdom of a policy which stands uncompromisingly condemned by the opinion which he then recorded under official responsibilty, is doubtless read with considerable surprise. Referring to the massacre of the British Envoy and his escort in September, 1879, the author says :—

> "I found Lord Lytton in a state of deep distress and depression. He strongly felt the collapse of the Mission and the heavy blow at the policy of rectifying our defective frontier and rendering India secure against foreign aggression —a policy which, at the present moment, is becoming what Lord Lytton, with his foresight and intelligent appreciation of our responsibilities and India's requirements, would then have made it."

The policy, in respect of which this flattering encomium is bestowed on Lord Lytton's foresight and intelligent appreciation of what is vaguely alluded to as "our responsibilities and India's requirements," was Lord Beaconfield's scientific frontier policy in the execution of which the Viceroy was but an obedient instrument in the hands of the Premier—a fact which is clearly implied by Lord Roberts himself at page 171, where he says:—

"My ideas about negotiations being premature were freely expressed to Colonel Colley, Lord Lytton's private secretary; but he explained to me that, right or wrong, the Viceroy had no option in the matter; that there was the strongest feeling in England against the continuance of the war."

Then as regards Lord Lytton's foresight, it appears to have been blind to the fatal doom to which he was sending the mission, while Lord Roberts seems to have exercised keener foresight on the occasion, since he had the strongest presentiments of Sir Louis Cavignari's fate, and tells us how exceedingly sad he felt when he accompanied that officer towards Kabul and took leave of him on the road.

These inconsistencies might appear insignificant; but they detract from the accuracy of the picture purporting to represent the actors in important events of the period; and as Lord Roberts's book may influence the future historian, the value of the lesson, which it is the province of history to teach, might be impaired, were even such inaccuracies in contemporaneous chronicles to remain unchallenged.

Another passage in the book obscures a very significant question, namely, whether the negotiations which resulted in the ominous treaty of Gandamak were initiated by us or by Yakub Khan. Lord Roberts tells us at page 168 that Yakub Khan, in communicating the death of his father, wrote that "he was anxious matters might be so arranged that the friendship of his State with the British Government may remain constant and firm." This might lead the reader to conclude that Yakub was the originator of those negotiations, while, as a matter of fact, they were opened by us. The translated extract which Lord Roberts mentions was taken from Yakub's answer to a letter which the British Agent had addressed to him. That letter has been kept secret, and was omitted in the papers presented to Parliament. Sir Louis Cavignari's telegram of 22nd February, however, clears up the obscured question by stating: "The letter affords favourable opportunity of opening negotiations with Yakub Khan."

By the treaty of Gandamak, the conclusion of which was brought about by the negotiations then opened by us, we bound ourselves to pay an annual subsidy to the Amír, although he rejected the conditions contended for by us, excepting our unwise and unfortunate claim to have a British Envoy accredited at his court. Of our other claims Lord Roberts says at page 169:—

"Yakub Khan declined to renounce his authority over the Khyber and Michni Passes and the tribes in their vicinity, and refused to consent to Kuram, Pishin and Sibi being placed under British protection and control."

The urgent necessity to terminate the war had been revealed to Lord Roberts in his conversation with Lord Lytton's private secretary; and that necessity soon became absolutely imperative, owing to the critical situations into which our armies had drifted.

The situation of the Khyber army is thus described in an Indian Government despatch to the Secretary of State:—

"The suspended activity of our troops on the Khyber line had begun to exercise a very prejudicial influence over our political as well as military position in Afghanistan, with the result of a recrudescence of petty but vexatious and harassing attacks from the surrounding tribes. At the same time the increasing heat of the weather and the defective sanitary condition of Jellalabad, had begun to tell injuriously on the health of the large force concentrated in that locality; and due regard to the well-being of our troops necessitated an immediate change of quarters." (C. 2461, 1879).

Regarding the Kuram Field Force commanded by General Roberts, Major Colquhoun's diary states:—

"January 7th. A string of camels which has been seized and were being led away, were still visible in the plain; but it would not have been possible, with the mass still hanging about, to attempt the recapture without the risk of being cut off. 14th. Disturbed all night by rumours that the Mangals intended attacking. Trenches were thrown up. 16th. No forage for camels; 400 sent back to Hazir Pir. 17th. The cold and indifferent supply of water affected the health of the troops; intermittent fever, pneumonia and dysentery began to show themselves. 29th. The fort of Matun (which we had to evacuate) was emptied of all powder and grain; but as there were not many camels available, the powder was poured into the wet ditch, and the grain which could not be carried off was set alight. The task being over, there remained two alternatives, either to fight the Mangals or to retire. The latter course was decided on; the enemy were in great force, and even if they had been driven back to the hills, nothing would have been gained, as they could not have been pursued. The Mangals, emboldened by our seeming inactivity, ventured out and formed a line a mile long towards the West. A little before 12 the retirement began while the enemy were still at a distance. February 2nd. A convoy of sick and wounded was ordered to march *viâ* the Darwaza Pass, as there was some chance that the Mangals might otherwise attack the party. On the night of the 2nd March, a raid was made by the Alisherais and Mamuzais. After killing five of our men and wounding seven, the raiders carried off 29 mules. May 30th. Alikheyl. The increasing heat is affecting the troops, and, in consequence of several cases of erysipelas, it was decided to move to Plateau A. The 67th regiment suffered more from a severe form of typhoid. June 3rd. The General and Staff rode up to the top of a spur with the idea of proceeding to the Hassan Kheyls valley; but the headman pointed out that part of this road lay through the Mangal territory, where opposition was likely to be met with. The idea was consequently abandoned. The party was taken up a spur which overlooked the pass. When the Mangals in the valley sighted the party on the ridge, their drums beat and they began to collect with the object of fighting, so the party returned to camp."

Lastly, as regards the Quetta army, the following entries in Major Le Messurer's published diary show the deplorable state in which that column found itself soon after the opening of the campaign:—

"January 7th. A biting cold wind all day: 260 camels are reported to have died. The water all along is brackish. Provisions are not easily obtained, and a foraging party was ordered towards Mirzan, viz., 2 guns 11.11 R.A., 100 sabres 15th Hussars, a squadron of the 19th Bengal Lancers, and a detachment of Sappers. The mail is unsafe; our men are stopped, stripped and flogged, and sometimes killed. 29th. Thermometer, 25 deg.; increased mortality among the camels. No more tobacco. February 2nd. We have turned back our steps towards Kandahar. One and all in the dumps. Whatever influence our political officer may have over the tribesmen must wane when they see our force quietly returning after

accomplishing so little. 4th. Commissariat out of wood. Camels dying off. 7th. Black frost last night; increased mortality among camels. 12th. A division of the forces, some going back to India. The bread we have been having and the water combined account for the sickness. April 6th. The stench from the dead camels along the line was scarcely bearable. 24th. Rode back to Kandahar, and heard of Colonel Fellowe's death; he was as fine a looking man as any of the force, and most active. June 23rd. One of the 60th sentries shot at last night. The colonel is laid up; Rogers, Hawkins and Oliver are all down with fever. July 14th. Cholera has appeared, ending fatally in fourteen cases. 17th. Cholera still busy at head-quarters and the two squadrons."

These papers conclusively account for the stringent necessity we found ourselves in to negotiate for peace on the best terms obtainable. The situation has been described with remarkable clearness by an officer serving with the forces, in a paper which was published in 1880, saying:—

"The war was commenced in ignorance of the difficulties to be encountered, and in consequence, at an early period, the Government found itself, with exhausted resources, compelled to make a peace which might almost have been dictated by its adversary. The enormous difficulty of carrying out a successful campaign in Afghanistan is due to two causes. The first cause is the absence of combined resistance. Attacking the Afghan tribes is like making sword thrusts into the water. You meet with no resistance, but you also do no injury. The tribes harass the communications of an invading army; they cut off straggling parties; they plunder baggage; they give the troops no rest; but they carefully avoid a decisive action. The invading force moves wherever it pleases; but it never holds more of the country than the ground on which it is actually encamped. Each separate tribe is, as it were, an independent centre of life which requires a separate and special operation for its extinction. The consequence is that the only way in which we could hope to enforce our authority would be by a simultaneous occupation of the entire country; and seeing that the country is as large as France, very sparsely populated, and quite incapable of feeding a large army, such an occupation is simply impossible. The other great difficulty is that there is scarcely any forage in Afghanistan, and consequently the transport train of an invading army cannot fail to be crippled after a few weeks of active service. The moment that such a catastrophe is consummated, an army in the field becomes as cumbersome and useless as a swan on a turnpike road. This latter difficulty it was which compelled the Government to make the treaty of Gandamak.

Lord Roberts's deservedly famed march to the Relief of Kandahar is narrated in Chapers LX and LXI with many details as to the composition of his army, the difficulty of securing transport and supplies, the sufferings endured from the barren and hilly nature of the land, the scarcity of water and the excessive variations of temperature from night to day. The main diffculty, however, which was apprehended, when the project was entertained, was the risk of being delayed on the road by armed tribal gatherings and the necessity of foraging for provisions—a risk which involved the chance of the relieving force not reaching Kandahar until that place had fallen before Ayub Khan's victorious army. From page 345 of Lord Roberts's book, it would appear that "the difficulties of daily procuring food for the 18,000 men and 11,000 animals were always overcome with the able assistance of Major Hastings and his political staff, and that the force arrived at Kandahar without opposition."

These statements are so irreconcileable with our previous experience, when supplies had to be obtained through the employment of strong foraging parties, and the tribes constantly manifested their hostility by raids or armed gatherings, that an explanation seems wanting to account for this marvellous change in the attitude of the Afghans. The book affords none, unless one be implied in the reference at page 338 to "the delicate and difficult negotiations which Mr. Griffin is said to have carried on with great skill and patience" shortly after the Maiwand disaster became known at Kabul.

Mr. Archibald Forbes, accordingly, in his history of the two Afghan wars, states at page 290 that:—

"On the 3rd August, when Mr. Griffin informed Abdar Rahman of the necessity of a British force marching from Kabul to Kandahar, so willing was the Amir to be of service in the matter that he sent influential persons of his party in advance to arrange with the local headmen to have supplies collected for the column."

Mr. Forbes tells us in the next page that "under the arrangement then concluded, the Amir was to receive 19½ lakhs of rupees—£195,000—ten lakhs of which were given as an earnest of British friendship and the balance was money belonging to the Afghan State," *i.e.*, the value of treasure seized by us during our occupation of Kabul.

The further conditions which we accepted on that occasion were to forego the fine we had imposed on the inhabitants of Kabul for their connivance at the massacre of the British Envoy and his escort, to deliver up the guns which were not required for the Kandahar expedition, and to hand over intact to the Amir the forts we had built around Kabul, and which we intended to destroy before evacuating the country.

It appears also from Mr. Stephen Wheeler's book on Abdar Rahman, published in 1895, at page 88, that—

"General Roberts started for Kandahar a week after Mr. Griffin's interview with the Amir, and that the remainder of the British troops, under Sir Donald Stewart, evacuated Sherpur and set out for India on August the 10th: also that the Amir did what he could to facilitate the march of the force, that General Roberts was preceded by officers of the Amir charged with collecting supplies and clearing the road of obstruction, and that the tribesmen were told that the Amir was sending a division of the infidel army out of the country by way of Kandahar." Mr. Wheeler adds: "This was not complimentary to us, but the Amir's message proved effectual."

Another part of Lord Roberts's book needs elucidation lest it should be interpreted as confirming an erroneous statement which has been sedulously circulated, to the effect that Abdar Rahman received his Amirship at our hands. Sir Lepel Griffin, through whom our communications with Abdar Rahman were carried on throughout, distinctly states in his article in the *Fortnightly* of December, 1893, that Abdar Rahman claimed sovereignty over the entire Kingdom which had been ruled by his grandsire, adding that "he had been chosen by the people of Afghanistan to protect the country in the name of Islam against all *infidel encroachments*." Indeed Mr. Howard Hensman's book had already informed the public of the utter failure of our endeavours to lead Abdar Rahman to some step which might give colour to the insinuation that he had received his Amirship from us. Mr. Hensman writes in his diary on the 4th June, 1880:

"Abdar Rahman is serenely independent in his attitude, and has given no promise whatever on any specific points con-

nected with the Amirship. He seems fully aware of our awkward position in the country. He is working to make the British, and not himself, the grateful party in the negotiations. There is a cool self-possessed tone of inquiry in his letter, as if he felt himself master of the situation, and meant to dictate his own terms. We are appearing in the eyes of the people rather as suppliants than as dictators to Abdar Rahman. July 2nd. We have so far lowered our pride as to treat with Abdar Rahman in order to secure peace. 22nd. We have formally acknowledged him as Amir. August 2nd. A strong division has been told off to march southward under Sir F. Roberts. The flower of the force being thus taken away, it becomes imperative that the army left in Sherpur should retire towards India without delay. 9th. Sir D. Stewart (with 20,000 men including camp-followers) left for India. His march will, it is expected, be a very peaceful one, as the chief Ghilzai leaders are with the Amir who has been quietly warned to keep them with him, and out of mischief, until our troops got to the east of Gandamak. How we have hated our sojourn in Afghanistan of late, only the record of our curses, an it be kept, can ever reveal."

Now, Lord Roberts tells us at page 372, vol. ii:—

"I now heard that Abdar Rahman had been finally nominated Amir of Kabul on the 10th August, and that immediately "after the ceremony of installation, Sir Donald Stewart had marched the whole British force out of Kabul on their return to India."

It seems impossible to doubt that the information on which the above lines were written, was essentially imperfect or intentionally misleading, seeing that the troops under Sir D. Stewart were not in Kabul on the 10th August, 1880, and that no account or reliable evidence whatever has, to this day, appeared of the alleged ceremony with which Sir D. Stewart is said to have installed Abdar Rahman, Amir of Kabul, within the walls of that city. Indeed the plight we were in at the time sufficiently reveals the untrustworthiness of the the report, and Lord Roberts does not mention on what ground he accepted its truth.

This correction is the more needed that it is argued, from the false report in question, that, having incurred serious responsibilies in appointing the Amir, we have acquired the consequent right to dictate to our nominee—an argument which is being used in favour of our making fresh attempts to execute the unsound "scientific frontier" policy so disastrously pursued in 1878-80.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

By Dinshaw Edulji Wacha.

It may be truly observed that, as far as the finances of India are concerned, they are of a most discouraging character. There are more lean than fat years. If there be years of financial prosperity, they are few and far between. According to official statistics there has been during the last forty-six years a net deficit of 38 crores of rupees. Of course, these years include years of mutiny. But in taking a broad survey of Indian finance, we cannot omit the years of deficit and only look to years of surplus. The fat and the lean years, the exceptional and the normal, must be put on the same level. For it should be remembered that if there have been exceptional years of war or famine, or both, or of low receipts or high expenditure, the Government has not been slow to demand additional taxes to defray deficits. But the official optimists who have such a horror of brooding over the dark side of Indian finance would have us believe that the exceptional years should not be thought of—which is only another way of suggesting that we have no right to take into consideration all that is damaging to the public finances of the country. This is, of course, quite an intelligible view from the standpoint of our heaven-born financiers—from Sir Richard Temple to Sir James Westland. Ostrich-like, they would wish us to bury our heads in sand at years of appalling deficit and to raise them up at years of surpluses, many of a doubtful character—for we cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that the finances of India are sometimes "cooked." There is no exaggeration in the statement. It was most effectively brought out in the evidence before the East India Committee of Finance in 1871-4, under the searching cross-fire of examination by the late lamented Professor Fawcett. How the accounts were cooked, how items of capital were credited to revenue and so forth, could be still read with profit and instruction in those admirable essays on Indian finance which that accurate and accomplished expert wrote. Every student of Indian finance should read, mark, and inwardly digest them.

It may, therefore, be safely asserted that the ordinary condition of Indian finance for the last half-century is one of chronic deficit. But even if we omit from consideration the deficits which arose on account of the expenditure incurred in quelling the mutiny, the result is hardly satisfactory. At the best, expenditure just balances income. There is no *true surplus* to speak of. So able and accomplished an expert in Indian finance as Sir J. Strachey had to say as much. India has no reserve of any kind whatever to fall back upon. The moment there is a large deficit we have to borrow either in rupees or sterling. There is no reserve upon which to draw even for a rupee, while borrowing only adds to the permanent charges which have to be paid out of revenue. The fact is that India, after all, *is* a poor country. It is no exception to that "Asiatic poverty" on which eminent writers on public finance have discoursed. The system of administration, on the other hand, is Western—that is to say, of a highly organised, and, therefore, most expensive character. To carry on a system of Western administration in an Asiatic country like India, with its Asiatic poverty, is indeed the very reverse of financial statesmanship. It is a system foredoomed to failure, and must, in the long run, end in a huge financial catastrophe. Unless there is a radical change in the system, I, for one, despair of ever witnessing any financial stability in Indian finance, much less financial prosperity. The taxpayers will be ground down more and more, while the harpies of the foreign tax-eaters will continue to drain to the very dregs the resources of the country—the products of the hard-earned labour of the teeming millions who find it so difficult to make both ends meet from year to year, and many of whom get not even one full meal a day.

Famine, unfortunately, has once more overtaken the land; and we see how that dire calamity has

affected our finances. The Budget for 1896-97 which was expected to work out to a surplus of 46 lakhs shows, according to the revised estimates, a net deficit of 1·98 crores; that is, after taking into consideration the windfall of 1·40 crores from "improved" exchange. Land revenue and railway receipts alone diminished to the extent of nearly 4 crores, while the State had to provide an expenditure of nearly 2 crores for famine up to the end of March last. Virtually, then, the closed accounts of 1896-97 show a deterioration of 2·44 crores, thus:

Estimated surplus	0·46 crores	(now vanished)
Deficit	1·98	,,
	2·44	,,

It should, however, be remembered that the diminution of 2·39 crores in land revenue is *not* a total loss to the State. If the next monsoon proves a fortunate one, a greater portion of this revenue will undoubtedly be recovered. The revenue is suspended, and the moment the rayats are able to pay it the State will exact its pound of flesh. What it may mean to the taxpayers, I need not say. It would in a large number of cases signify *increased* indebtedness. The rayat who has survived the famine will toil hard at his field. But he will have to borrow from the moneylender to buy his implements of agriculture, and something besides to maintain him and his family till the harvest is reaped and the State Shylock is satisfied. And it would be a miracle if he could again begin to prosper at the end of the next five years. Every famine leaves the cultivator in a worse position than before. His indebtedness increases, and poverty therefore grows on him more and more.

But I need not tarry on this economic aspect of the subject. I have said that the net deficit is nearly 2 crores. Now, I maintain that this deficit might have been nowhere had the Finance Minister not been in such hot hurry last year to dispose of the surplus of 1¼ crore he obtained in 1895-96 from better exchange. Sir David Barbour truly observed that there is a mischievous tendency on the part of the Government to take every advantage of transient or apparent prosperity. It hastens to dispose of its surplus without taking thought of the morrow. It discards in the management of the finances the ordinary rules of caution and prudence. It ignores the bitter experience of the past, and it fritters away, like the prodigal, all moderate surpluses on objects of a most questionable, if not worthless character.

Let us see how the 1¼ crore of surplus—an accident—derived from better exchange in 1895-96 was disposed of. In the first place, the Government of India gifted away with a light heart half a-crore to pious and disinterested Manchester, in "loyal" obedience to the "mandate" of the Secretary of State. In spite of the united protest of all India, Indian and Anglo-Indian, in the teeth of remonstrances of the European Chambers of Commerce and the Bombay Mill Owners' Association, it reduced the import duty on cotton goods from 5 to 3½ per cent under the plea of removing the so-called "protection" enjoyed by Indian mill-owners. Not only was this half-crore sacrificed. It was a *permanent* sacrifice of revenue: so long as this duty is maintained, it is a sacrifice to the tune of half a crore. Can the State justify this needless sacrifice? Could any far-sighted Government, having the same economic conditions as India has, ever care to sacrifice this revenue in the manner the Indian Government did last year? If nothing else, ordinary prudence would have avoided it. That is one part of want of financial foresight. The other part has reference to the half-crore gifted away with equal disregard to the interests of the taxpayers, who are still burdened with the enhanced duty on salt, and which was promised by Lord Dufferin should go off at the first opportunity to the military department for purposes of mobilisation! This mobilisation, of course, was a logical necessity of the occupation, the unrighteous occupation, of Chitral, which has already entailed on the general revenues of the country a further burden of 25 lakhs per annum. Thus the crore could have been easily saved. Had it been allowed to stand over—or put by—the Finance Minister would have been able to diminish his deficit by that sum. In other words he would have had to borrow less by a crore, now that the deficit has to be made up by borrowing.

But I have yet to bring another fact to the notice of the reader. This is so far as the disposition of the surplus of 1895-96. But it may be reasonably asked, what steps did the Government take to curtail expenditure for partially meeting the deficit of 2 crores in 1896-7? There is not a word in the financial statement about it. Neither has Sir James Westland condescended to enlighten the public in the speech he made on the debate. All that we are able to glean from the preliminary observations in the financial statement is that 38 lakhs were saved in 1896-7. What a curtailment to be sure, when the estimated surplus of half-a-crore has vanished away and a net deficit of nearly 2 crores has had besides to be incurred! It cost them nothing to gift away a crore to two vested interests; but it never occurred to them to see how the deficit could be met without the necessity of borrowing, which, I repeat, adds to the burden of the permanent charges against revenue by way of interest. And yet we are called to admire this piece of finance and clap our hands in praise of our heaven-born financier that he has not exhibited a worse statement.

As to the Budget for the current year, of course, there is a deficit of 2·64 crores, owing to the expenditure on famine, estimated at 3·56 crores. There has been no attempt at curtailment of a *permanent* character. Civil works alone are diminished to the tune of 36 lakhs. Military expenditure virtually stands the same as before. They speciously talk of a "reduction" of 51 lakhs compared with last year; but the reader need not be told that this is pure moonshine. They gave 50 lakhs for mobilisation. This was, according to the authorities, an exceptional expenditure. Those 50 lakhs have not recurred this year. This is pointed out as a "saving," and we are absurdly asked to believe that the Government have reduced military expenditure by half-a-crore! This is simply throwing dust in the public eyes. In reality, they have shown no curtailment of a

permanent character in any department. The moment the stress of the present financial condition is removed, there is every probability of an increase rather than a decrease. And if, as I have said before, the suspended land revenue is rigidly collected, the Finance Minister will take credit for having reduced his deficit, when he recounts his financial tale of this year, twelve months hence. Aye, he would even work the miracle of showing a surplus. We have been accustomed to such prodigies in finance in India—of surpluses being converted into deficits, and *vice versa*. Sir John Strachey did that in 1878-79; and what was easy for Sir John to do, would not be difficult for Sir James in 1898-99. But the Budget is so full of fallacies that it is impossible I can refer to them at any length in this place. Again, Sir James loomed large in the official eyes by airing his views on famine charges, protective railways and irrigation works, and provincial assignments. All these are "large" subjects to which it is impossible to do justice in these columns. But the debate on the Budget shows very clearly how necessary it is that the power of moving amendments on the annual financial statement should be conceded without further delay. At present the popular representatives in the Imperial Legislative Council can only speak once, and there is an end of the matter. The Finance Minister has the last word. His speech may be full of fallacies to which the popular representatives might give a rejoinder, but as they are debarred, their mouths are closed. A fallacious impression remains on the mind of the public, specially the British public, and the delusion is created that after all the finances are not so badly managed as they are represented, while non-official criticism is either shallow or ignorant. The suppression of the truth and the suggestion of the false—which is the distinguishing feature of some bureaucrats—cannot be more glaringly perceived in all its nakedness than in the exposition of the annual financial statement. Thus is India financially governed.

LAND REVENUE SETTLEMENT IN MADRAS.

By G. Subramania Iyer.

The question of the duration of settlements came up for discussion during Lord Wenlock's administration in the Presidency of Madras, and the Madras Government decided to recommend a term of twenty years instead of the thirty which has been the period of settlements till now. The following quotation from the Government Order explains the reasons that led to this recommendation:—

"After careful deliberation, the Government has arrived at the conclusion that the present period is too long and should be curtailed. His Excellency in Council does not lose sight of the primary importance to the rayat of the assurance that the lease of his holding should not, except at the end of lengthened periods, be disturbed by an enhancement of the assessment which he has to pay. A long term undoubtedly gives a sense of security and confidence, while the land market has greater chances of stability; but the great fluctuations that have occurred during the last few years in the currency of the country, the extension of communications bringing distant products within the influence of universal market prices, and generally, the rapidity with which material and economic changes are proceeding, must bring about a great disturbance in the money value of produce. In these circumstances, it is, in the opinion of Government, on the one hand imprudent to lock up for a period so long as thirty years the State's right to avail itself of the increment that may manifest itself in the value of the produce of the soil; while, on the other hand, it is possible that the pendulum may swing the other way and the prices drop to such an extent that it would be prejudicial to the rayat to deprive him for a protracted term of the opportunity of a revaluation of his assessment. Moreover, in the event of a continuous development in the value of landed property, it is frequently both difficult and inadvisable on a resettlement to demand anything like proportionate increase in the revenue which the rise of prices would justify, and the longer the term of settlement, the more serious the difficulty becomes. This restraint upon the enforcement of the just demand is to some extent obviated by the rule obtaining in this Presidency, which permits the total enhancement, if considerable, to be reached by easy annual additions to the former assessment; but by this expedient the objection is by no means altogether removed."

The reasons, it will be seen, all relate to the interest of the Government. The whole question is looked at from the Government's revenue point of view. Financial considerations of the State prevail over those of the prosperity of the rayats. It is only crocodile tears that Government sheds when it affects to safeguard the rayat's interests by anticipating the possibility of a drop in the prices and a reduction in the valuation of the assessment. The Government has never committed the blunder of reducing the land tax in a single instance of re-settlement. Such a contingency is highly improbable. Who believes that the prices of raw produce in India will drop to the extent suggested by the Government of Madras? We are not sure that the Government itself believes what it suggests as probable. The increasing demand of a growing population, the successive years of drought and scarcity, and the extension of railway communications, would combine to keep the prices at a high level. Considering, moreover, that a large majority of our producers are also consumers, and that in spite of fallen prices, long terms of settlement have their own distinct advantages, the rayats will welcome with joy long term settlements under any circumstances. What decision the Secretary of State has arrived at is not known. But to a question put in the Legislative Council in December last, the Madras Government replied in the following vague terms:

"The policy approved is to respect reasonable expectations based upon past practice, but special circumstances may necessitate an abbreviation of the usual term. The question whether they do so is one to be decided in each case upon its separate merits."

Is it a wonder then that the industry of agriculture in India suffers under all the disadvantages of this glorious uncertainty? Lord Wenlock lamented "the almost absolute divorce from the cultivation of the soil—the principal industry of the country—of men of position and high educational attainments." But the fact is hardly more lamentable than the ignorance of the Governor, surrounded as he was by a number of able and experienced administrators, members of the most glorious civil service in the world. I have no hesitation in stating that this "divorce" is due to the effect on the security and

value of property of the operations of the Land Revenue Settlement Department. No educated person will care to devote his intelligence or money to increasing the produce of the land when he knows that the law does not secure to him the fruits of his industry. None will invest money in the improvement of his land when the revenue officials will, within a few years, certainly take half, or more, of the increased yield due to his enterprise, intelligence, and capital; and there is no law prohibiting them from appropriating the entire yield. In revenue matters the Executive Government is everything. The Civil Courts of Justice are prohibited from enquiring into the justice of any land revenue claim of the Government. Various laws have been passed and every device is resorted to in view to this end.

In 1888, Lord Connemara appointed a Committee to institute a "comprehensive enquiry into the constitution and operations of the Agricultural Department with a view of ascertaining what practical good it has done and is doing, and what good such a department might do under other conditions."

The State is the landlord in India, but unlike other countries where the rents are fixed not *by* the landlord but *for* the landlord, in some instances by custom, in others by competition, in India the landlord fixes the rent at any sum he chooses, and in practice in the Madras Presidency he fixes it at the maximum which he thinks can be extracted in good years, after leaving the tenant the barest subsistence allowance, and granting grudgingly—if at all—remissions in bad years, when threats, distress and evictions are alike found useless for the extraction of the full amount. It is obvious that a more effectual plan for keeping the agricultural population in hopeless misery and indebtedness could scarcely be devised. Such a state of things leaves no margin for a capitalist farmer to intervene or to spring into being; but if any one were Quixotic enough to venture on such an enterprise, he would be assuredly prevented by the uncertainty attending even this rack rent, and the certainty that his improvements will at an early date afford ample excuse to the Government for its enhancement.

And what did this Committee say regarding the desirability of finality in settlements?

"That Government be moved to enunciate and make widely known a final policy in the matter of its settlement rules, more especially those relating to the grain valuation of the soil; it is clear from the evidence of highly intelligent and well-informed witnesses" (including, I may mention in passing, the Hon. Justice Subramania Iyer, C.I.E., a Judge of the High Court) "that there exists a widespread feeling of distrust regarding the finality of the grain valuation of soils, and that this feeling largely restrains the investment of capital in the improvement of land. It is stated that so long as any uncertainty regarding the policy of the Government in this matter is permitted to continue, the tenure of land on the rayatwari system is not stable, and that it cannot be stable unless and until the Government declare that in future revisions of assessments the soil valuation and classification first adopted by the Settlement Department shall be final, and will never be disturbed in any future revision."

The Committee further recommended:—

"The second matter is that there appears to be a feeling of mistrust regarding the finality of the grain values assigned to soils by the Settlement Department when revising assessments for the first time. It is feared that future revisions of assessments will be determined on a consideration, not of prices only, but of soils also. A re-valuation of soils at each recurring revision would, it is said—and we think rightly said—be fatal to improvement. We believe that the present opinion of the Government is opposed to such a re-valuation, and is inclined to make the settlements permanent so far as the grain values of soils are concerned, but there has been no distinct avowal that this will be the policy that will guide future revisions of assessments, while the statement on p. 110, Vol. I. of the Madras Manual of Administration, that at future revisions, soils are liable to re-valuation, and the fact that sanction has been accorded to the re-classification of soils in the Chidambaram and Monnargudi Taluks of South Arcot, which were first settled in 1861-62, and are due to be re-settled on the expiration of the thirty years term of their first settlement in 1890-91, give a solid foundation for the want of confidence to which we have alluded. We consider, therefore, that Government should distinctly declare by legislation that, in any revision of assessment that may be made after the first, soils will not be revalued. In this way, the value of his improvements will be absolutely secured to the rayat, for they will afford no basis for the enhancement of the Government demand upon him, and the stability of his tenure will be assured."

In its order upon this report the Government of Lord Connemara said, *inter alia* (G. O. 4th July, 1889, No. 515):—

"The recommendation that legislation should be undertaken for the purpose of defining authoritatively the status of the rayat need not be noticed at length for it is made under a misapprehension of the real fact. . . . Nor has the Government any intention of revising the classification of soils. This principle has been repeatedly laid down, and is very clearly stated in the Settlement Manual. The statement to the contrary in the Manual of Administration is incorrect, and the re-classification of the Chidambaram Taluk is not a violation of the assurances of Government, as this Taluk has never been settled on the system now followed throughout the rest of the Presidency."

But all this has been changed. The financial difficulties of the Government have given rise to new policy and to new principles. In its order dated 11th May, 1895, the Madras Government, cancelling all its previous orders, laid down:

"At each settlement or re-settlement of a District, Government will fix at its discretion the period for which such settlement or re-settlement shall be in force. The Collector shall then notify the period in the *District Gazette*, and explain to the rayats that the new rates will not be liable to alteration during the currency of the settlement period; but that on the expiry of the said period Government reserves to itself the right to revise the assessments in such a manner as may then seem just and proper, either with reference solely to a rise or fall in prices, or with reference also to other considerations such as would require a re-classification of soils or a re-calculation of the grain out-turns. It should be further explained that Government will refrain from enhancing the assessment in respect of any additional value which may have been given to land by improvements effected by the rayats even if carried out by means of money borrowed from Government."

On these principles the re-settlement of Trichinopoly has been carried out. Over 111,336 acres of the best land in the district were brought under re-classification. In regard to 55,859 other acres in the district re-classification was suspended because "These lands are particularly poor and do not at present admit of any large enhancement of assessment." The admission of the Government that the increase of revenue—and not the interest of the rayats or that of the general taxpayers—is the inducement to these re-settlements, is noteworthy.

Nobody believes in the assertion that in these re-settlements scientific accuracy is aimed at. The amounts of additional assessment are fixed beforehand, and to arrive at these the Department manipu-

lates the figures and adopts a rough and ready method of adding to the existing rates. In the Trichinopoly re-settlement 12½ per cent. was added in a rough way without regard to the system of revision laid down in the manual and the result is that the increment is far from being evenly distributed over all different descriptions of land into which the arable area was originally classified. Thus in one case the percentage of increment per acre is 5 as. 5 p. and the actual 4 as. 10 p., whilst in another the figures are 3 as. 5 p. and 4 as. 7 pies respectively. The Tanjore revenue before the last settlement amounted to 41 lakhs. The settlement officers reported that "if the district were to be treated on scientific principles," the increase would be 28 lakhs, or 70 per cent. They had however not the heart to be too scientific, and suggested an increase of 18½ lakhs, or 45 per cent. The Board of Revenue reduced the amount to 12½ lakhs, or an increase of 30½ per cent., and the Government further reduced it to 11½ lakhs, or 28 per cent. Where is the scientific accuracy in all this process? We can only trace a guess as to how far the rayats can be safely squeezed to meet the exigencies of Government.

[Since writing the above, I have learnt at the India Office that the proposal to reduce the duration of settlements to twenty years has not been sanctioned by the Secretary of State, and that they would be fixed for a period of thirty years as hitherto.]

"CONCILIATION OR LITIGATION."

The following is the text of the draft Bill referred to by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., in his article "Conciliation or Litigation" printed in our last issue:—

DRAFT SECTIONS.

* * * And whereas with a view to bring about conciliation, and promote friendly feelings between the money-lenders and agricultural classes, and to diminish the expense of litigation and to render the principal and more intelligent and respectable inhabitants useful by employing them in administering justice to their neighbours, it is desirable that suits against agriculturists should be disposed of by Panchâyats; * * * it is enacted as follows:

Preamble Mad. Reg. V of 1816.

1. It shall be lawful for the Local Government to establish in any District, Panchâyats to receive, try, and determine suits against agriculturists. The number of Panchâyats to be established under this section shall be fixed and may, from time to time, be altered by the Local Government. The Local Government shall fix, and may, from time to time, vary the local limits of the jurisdiction of such Panchâyats. The "Panches," or persons eligible to serve upon the Panchâyats, shall be selected by the Subordinate Judge and an officer deputed by the Collector, in personal consultation with the people dwelling within the local limits for which the Panchâyat is constituted. The lists of Panches shall be published in the *Government Gazette*. The Courts of arbitration constituted by Government under this section shall be called Panchâyat Courts, and the members for the time being who are selected by the parties out of the list published by Government to act as arbitrators shall be called Panches.

Bengal Civil Courts Act, 1871, Section 3 and 18.

2. In any District or part of a District in which Panchâyats shall have been established under the last preceding section, it shall be lawful for the Local Government to declare, by notification in the *Government Gazette*, that on and after a certain date all suits, in which an agriculturist is a defendant, shall be brought in the Panchâyat within the local limits of which one of the defendants being an agriculturist shall, at the time of the commencement of the suit, dwell; and from the said date no Civil Court shall entertain any suit against an agriculturist dwelling within such District except as provided for in this Act, provided further that nothing herein contained shall affect the provisions of Sections 525 and 526 of the Civil Procedure Code. It shall be lawful for the Local Government from time to time to alter or rescind such notifications.

3. The jurisdiction of the Panchâyat shall extend to all suits brought against agriculturists, without limit as to amount or value. The ordinary rules of the Limitation Act shall be applicable to suits brought in the Panchâyat. Provided that in suits brought to recover money lent or interest the period of limitation shall be 12 years from the time when the debt or interest became due. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to extend the period for suits already barred by any law for the time being in force.

Madras Reg. V of 1816, Sec. 2, Cl. 1.

4. The Local Government shall declare by notification in the official Gazette the number of villages which shall constitute the local jurisdiction of each Panchâyat. The officiating Patel and Kulkarni of each village shall be *ex-officio* Nazir and Clerk to the Panchâyat as regards suits brought against any defendant dwelling in his village. It shall be the duty of the Patel and Kulkarni to receive plaints and to keep the register and proceedings of the Panchâyat. For these duties they shall receive from the fees such remuneration as Government shall direct.

Madras Reg. V of 1816, S. 10. Bo. Reg. VII of 1827, S. 4, Cl. 1.

5. When a plaintiff desires to bring a suit he shall present to the Patel and Kulkarni of his village a written plaint which shall state precisely the nature of the claim, the time when the cause of action arose, the name and residence of the defendant or defendants, the total amount or value of the property claimed, and all material circumstances which may elucidate the transaction. He shall also state in writing the names of the person or persons from the list of Panches, who he proposes should form the Panchâyat for the trial of the suit.

Madras Regulation V of 1816, S. 4, Cl. 4.

6. On receiving the plaint the Patel and Kulkarni shall without delay send a village servant to call the defendant. If he fails to come they shall serve upon him a summons setting forth briefly the nature and amount of the claim, and fixing a day for his appearance to answer the plaint. When the defendant appears, the Patel and Kulkarni shall confront him with the plaintiff in the presence of one or more Panches; and it shall be the duty of the Patel and Kulkarni and the Panches present to exert themselves to the best of their power to induce the parties to come to an amicable settlement among themselves. They shall draw up a brief note of their proceedings and put their signatures to it. If parties cannot come to an amicable settlement, they shall ask the defendant whether he agrees that the case should be disposed of by the Panchâyat; and if so whether he accepts as the Panchâyat the person or persons named by the plaintiff. If the defendant is willing to have the case decided by the Panchâyat but does not agree to the Panches proposed by the plaintiff, then each of the parties shall elect an equal number of Panches and shall jointly appoint one other person from the List as Sir Panch or Umpire.

6. (*a*) When there are more defendants than one, and all of them do not reside in the same village, the plaintiff may present his plaint to the Patel and Kulkarni of any one of the villages in which one of the defendants, being an agriculturist, may reside; and the Patel and Kulkarni shall arrange to summon the other defendants either through the Subordinate Judge within whose jurisdiction they may be residing, or the Patel and Kulkarni of other villages if they be situated within the jurisdiction of the same Panchâyat.

6. (*b*) No Patel or Kulkarni shall take any proceedings in a suit in the subject matter of which either of them may be directly or indirectly interested as plaintiff or defendant; but on receiving the plaint in such a suit, they shall immediately report the matter to the Subordinate Judge, who shall thereupon appoint the Patel and Kulkarni of some other neighbouring village to be the Nazir and Clerk of the Panchâyat with respect to such suit, and shall transfer the suit to them.

7. If any person on the Pancháyat List, who has been selected by the parties, dies or is unable, or neglects, or refuses to serve, the party or parties who selected him may name a substitute. If a person selected neglects or refuses to serve without reasonable cause it shall be the duty of the clerk to report to the Subordinate Judge within whose local jurisdiction the case arises. The Subordinate Judge shall enquire into the matter, and if he is of opinion that such person has neglected or refused without reasonable cause, he may fine him in a sum not exceeding Rs. 5.

Mad. Reg. V of 1816, S. 3, Cl. 1.

8. When the parties are agreed as to the constitution of the Pancháyat, such Pancháyat shall proceed with all due diligence to take up the case. It shall commence its proceedings by requiring from the parties a "Rázinámá" or agreement in writing to abide by the decision of the Pancháyat as above constituted. In investigating the matter referred to it, the Pancháyat shall examine the documents and witnesses produced by the parties. It shall not, however, be bound by the formal rules of evidence, but shall adopt such mode of enquiry and proof as shall appear to it most conclusive to ascertain the facts of the case.

Bo. Reg. VII of 1827, S. 4, Cl. 1.

9. The parties shall ordinarily produce their own witnesses and documents, and it shall be the duty of the Patel and Kulkarni to give the parties every assistance in their power to procure the attendance of the witnesses. The Pancháyat shall also have the power to require the production of such documents or witnesses as they consider are essential for the proper decision of the case. In the case of witnesses neglecting to attend when called by the village servants, and in the case of witnesses resident in other villages, the clerk shall on the application of the party issue a summons which may be served direct or through the Subordinate Judge. Any person, upon whom such a summons has been served, and who disobeys such summons, shall be liable to the penalties stated in Section 174 of the Indian Penal Code. The Pancháyat shall also have the power to administer an oath to witnesses before examining them; and any witness who gives a wilful false evidence, while under oath, shall be liable to the penalties stated in Section 193 of the Indian Penal Code.

Bo. Reg. VII of 1827, S. 4, Cl. 2.

10. When both parties have been heard and the whole of the evidence gone through, the Pancháyat shall pronounce an award according to justice and right. The award shall contain the names of the parties, the date of reference, the nature and value of the matter referred, and the decision made; it shall be dated and signed by the arbitrator if sole, otherwise by the majority which made the award, and by the umpire, if any. In cases of debt below Rs. 50 in amount, it shall be discretionary with the Pancháyat to take down the depositions of the witnesses at full length or not, but in such cases, when depositions in full are not taken, it shall be the duty of the Pancháyat to keep a brief note of the proceedings. In all other suits, the depositions shall be taken down in full and shall be signed by the witnesses, after they are read out to them and corrected if necessary, and the members of the Pancháyat shall also sign the same.

Mad. Reg. V of 1816, S. 4, Cl. 10 and S. 6.
Bo. Reg. VII of 1827, S. 8, Cl. 1.

11. Looking to the great advantages from a friendly settlement, it shall throughout the proceedings be the duty of the Pancháyat to induce the parties if possible to come to an equitable arrangement among themselves. When a settlement is agreed to by the parties the Pancháyat may pass an award in accordance with such settlement.

12. If the defendant does not agree to have the case tried by a Pancháyat, or if the parties cannot agree as to the constitution of the Pancháyat, the clerk shall call upon the plaintiff to pay within one month the Court fees due upon the plaint according to the law for the time being in force. If he pays the amount within the time, the case will be referred to the Subordinate Judge who shall try it at that place when he moves on circuit in accordance with the rules to be made in that behalf by Government. In cases when both parties agree or sufficient and special cause is shown to the satisfaction of the Sub-Judge to have the suit transferred, it may be tried in the station where the Civil Court is ordinarily held. The rules to be framed under this section shall provide that the Subordinate Judge shall go on circuit for 15 days in every month except during the monsoon. If the plaintiff fails to pay the amount within the required time, the suit shall be struck off, and the time during which the plaintiff has been engaged in prosecuting his suit before the Pancháyat shall not be excluded in computing any period of limitation.

13. When a suit has been reserved for trial by the Subordinate Judge, the Clerk shall forthwith report the fact to the Subordinate Judge within whose local jurisdiction the Pancháyat is situated. When the Subordinate Judge has fixed the date on which he will visit the village on circuit he shall inform the Clerk who will have all reserved cases ready for trial on that day. The Subordinate Judge shall select one or more assessors from the Pancháyat List, including among them if possible the one or more of the Panches who were present at the time when the amicable settlement was attempted and dispose of the cases brought before him. He shall record the opinions of the assessors, but the decision is vested exclusively in the Subordinate Judge.

14. All awards made by the Pancháyat shall, within 3 days from the date of the award, be forwarded by the Patel and Kulkarni with all the papers of the case to the Subordinate Judge having jurisdiction to file them. The party who desires to have his award filed shall apply to the Subordinate Judge, who will direct the Kulkarni to issue notices to the other parties informing them of the dates when the Subordinate Judge will come on circuit to the village and require them to show cause why the award shall not be filed. The Subordinate Judge on his arrival shall hear all objections and, if no sufficient cause is shown, the awards shall be filed and shall have the force of decrees of the Court. If the Subordinate Judge decides that the awards should not be filed, the plaintiff will be called on to pay the Court fees within one month and have the suit disposed of as a reserved case by the Subordinate Judge under the last preceding section. If the plaintiff neglects to pay the fees within one month the suit shall be struck off, and the time during which the plaintiff has been engaged in prosecuting his suit before the Pancháyat shall not be excluded in computing any period of limitation. In cases of emergency, when special and sufficient cause is shown, the Sub-Judge may at any time entertain an application to file the award and pass an order, after issuing notices to the parties and hearing any objections they may have to urge. The objections to the filing of the award must be of the nature of those specified in sections 520 and 521 of the Civil procedure Code, and the award may be returned for amendment in the manner provided in Section 520.

15. If any party to a suit, which has been referred for trial to a Pancháyat, complains that the suit is not being proceeded with with due diligence the Subordinate Judge shall enquire into the matter. If he is of opinion that the complaint is just, and if the suit has remained undisposed of for more than two months, he may assemble the Pancháyat and dispose of the suit, he acting *ex-officio* as Sir Panch, with a casting vote. The award made will have the effect of an award under section 10. When the Subordinate Judge proceeds on circuit he shall examine the records of the Pancháyats and shall advise and encourage them in the performance of their duties.

16. No appeal shall lie against the award of a Pancháyat passed under this Act; but an appeal shall lie to the District Judge against the order of the Subordinate Judge directing an award to be filed or rejecting it.

17. When an award has been filed, the Subordinate Judge shall execute it in the same manner as one of his own decrees, but he shall as far as possible execute it through the village officers, who shall be bound to give all necessary assistance. Payments to the judgment creditor may be made in the presence of one or more Panches and a receipt in writing for such payments shall be passed and be countersigned by the Panches in whose presence they were made.

18. In the Pancháyats the parties may appear by pleader or recognised agent as provided by the Code of Civil Procedure. They may also be represented by a relative, partner, gumasta, servant, or dependent, provided such person is provided with a vakálatnámá describing his relation to his employer and the matter in which he is empowered to act. Such vakálatnámá must be filed in the suit. In the Pancháyat no costs will be allowed on account of a pleader or agent.

Mad. Reg. V of 1816, S. 7, Cl. 3.

19. Suits tried by Panchâyats shall be exempt from fees, stamp duties, batta and all charges of every description, except that when a petition is made to file the award a fee will be charged according to such scale as may be fixed from time to time by Government, provided that it shall not exceed the proportion of four annas to every ten rupees of the value or amount claimed. In case of immoveable property the fee will be fixed according to its market value.

Mad. Reg. V of 1816, S. 13. Bom. Reg. VII of 1827, S. 3, Cl. 1, S. 4, Cl. 2. And see Stamp Bill No. 16 of 1877, (Honourable Mr. Cockerill) Schedule 6 art, 9 (c).

20. The District Court shall with the previous sanction of the High Court have the power to frame such rules, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, as it may consider necessary to guide the procedure of the Subordinate Judges and the Panchâyats. It shall also be the duty of the District Judge to exercise, as far as may be, careful personal supervision over the working of the Panchâyats.

Mahadeo Rao Govinde Ranade, Sub-Judge, Nassick; Vishnu Moreshwar Bhide, Sub-Judge, Surat; Chintamon Sakharam Chitnis, Sub-Judge, Poona; Krishnajee Vishnu Limaye, Late Sub-Judge; Shriniwas Shesho Hattibelgalkar, Late Native Assistant Revenue Commissioner, S. D.; Amrit Shriput Nagpoorkar, Sub-Judge Sangamneir, Nagar District; Sadashiva Ballal Gounde, Late Assistant Inam Settlement Officer, S. D.; Krishna Rao Sadashiv Jolekar, Sub-Judge Barsi, Sholapur District; Chintamon Rao Hari Deshmukh, Late Sub-Judge; Ganpat Amrit Mankar, Sub-Judge Khed, Poona District; Nowroji Dorabji Khandalawala, Sub-Judge Wadgaum, Poona District; Ganesh Wasudeo Joshi, Pleader, District Court, Poona District; Dinkar Ballal Chakradeo, Pleader, District Court, Sholapoor; Govind Mahadeo Gadre, Pleader, District Court, Poona; Gangadhar Govind Gokhale, Sowcar, Poona District; Kevalchand Khubchand, Sowcar, Nassick District; Sitaram Hari Chiplonkar, Editor Quarterly Journal, Poona, Sarvajanik Sabha.

Poona, 23*rd May*, 1879.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1897.

BLACKWOOD'S MAGAZINE. "An Indian Romance; A Lesson of the Famine."

CHAMBERS'S JOURNAL. Smith, Dr. George, "A Century and a Half of British Power in India."

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW. Rock, Joseph, "The New Era in Hyderabad."

FRANK LESLIE'S POPULAR MONTHLY. Forman, Florence F., "Locomotion in India."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW. Jardine, Mr. Justice, "Present Thought and Sentiment in India." Rogers, Alex., "Indian Sanitation."

INVESTOR'S REVIEW. "Sir Charles Elliott and the Indian Famine Insurance Fund."

MONTH. Dunn, S. H., "A Wedding and a Burial in India."

MUSICAL VISITOR. Lewis, Dr. J. H., "Hindu Music."

NINETEENTH CENTURY. Lyall, Sir Alfred, "India under Queen Victoria."

UNITED SERVICE. "The Indian Mutiny in Fiction."

UNITED SERVICE MAGAZINE. Pearse, H. W., "Kafiristan"

WESTMINSTER REVIEW. "India and Her Friends."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JUNE, 1897.

CLUTTERBUCK, REV. G. W. .... "In India (The Land of Famine and of Plague) or Bombay the Beautiful, The First City of India." (The Ideal Publishing Union.) .... — —

HUNTER, SIR WILLIAM WILSON .... "Annals of Rural Bengal." (Smith, Elder & Co.) .... 7s. 6d.

BRANDIS, SIR DIETRICH, F.R.S. .... "Indian Forestry". (Oriental University Institute, Woking.) .... — —

RECENT OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

HOUSE OF LORDS PAPERS:—

[58.] EAST INDIA COMPANY'S OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION—Bill to remove doubts as to the power of the Secretary of State in Council of India to grant Superannuation and Compensation Allowances in certain cases to Officers on his Establishment .... 0s. 1d.

[61.] REGULAR AND ELDERS' WIDOWS' FUND—Bill to make provision for the transfer of the Assets, Liabilities, and Management of the Regular Widows' Fund and of the Elders' Widows' Fund to the Secretary of State in Council of India, and for other purposes in relation thereto .... 0s. 1½d.

HOUSE OF COMMONS REPORTS AND PAPERS:—

[151.] EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN ENGLAND)—Return of, for the half year ended on 31st March, 1897 .... 0s. 0½d.

[182.] EAST INDIA (APPOINTMENT OF NATIVES)—Correspondence regarding the Appointment of qualified Natives to certain Posts in the Educational and other Departments hitherto held by Europeans .... 0s. 1d.

[217.] ARMY (DISEASE)—Return of the Amount of all Classes of Venereal Disease (including simple Venereal Ulcers) for all Stations where the Act was in force, from 1864 to 1883; and similar Return from 1886 to 1895. 0s. 0½d.

PAPERS BY COMMAND:—

[8382.] EAST INDIA (CONTAGIOUS DISEASES), No. 2 (1897)—Memorandum by the Army Sanitary Commission, and Correspondence, regarding the Prevalence of Venereal Disease among the British Troops in India .... 0s. 1d.

[8386.] INDIA: OUTBREAK OF PLAGUE—Papers relating to the Outbreak of Bubonic Plague in India; with Statement showing the Quarantine and other Restrictions recently placed upon Indian Trade, up to March, 1897 .... 0s. 11d.

[8388.] FAMINE AND RELIEF OPERATIONS IN INDIA—Further Papers regarding the Famine and Relief Operations in India during the years 1896-97. (*In continuation of* [8302]) ...... 2s. 3d.

[8401.] EAST INDIA (CONTAGIOUS DISEASES), No. 4 (1897)—Despatch to the Government of India regarding the Measures to be adopted for Checking the Spread of Venereal Disease among the British Troops in India; with Appendix .... 0s. 1d.

GUARDIANSHIP.—MR. C. C. ORD, M.A., of Magdalen College, and Secretary of the Appointments Committee in the University of Oxford, acts as Guardian to persons coming to England for Education, and gives information as to the methods available of Education, General and Professional. Address Secretary, INFORMATION OFFICE (opposite Examination Schools), 44, High Street, Oxford, England.—(Advt.)

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of INDIA cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., TRINITY STREET, CAMBRIDGE; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

INDIA presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of INDIA, 84 and 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, JULY, 1897.

SOME LESSONS OF THE FAMINE.

UNDER the title "Permanent Preventives of Famine" the *Times* has lately published a series of articles by its well-known writer on Indian Affairs which are noteworthy in themselves as well as for their appearance in a journal too often associated with the rigidly official point of view. Despite an evident intention to give the Government full credit for what it has done the writer is forced by the course of his able enquiry to the following conclusion: "Let it be frankly acknowledged that the Indian "Government has ably and loyally performed the "task assigned to it in 1877. But we now see that "that task did not comprise the whole work which "lay before the British rulers." If one consents to waive for the moment the important question of the Famine Fund and its suspension, one may concur in this conclusion. The prevention or alleviation of famine falls naturally under four heads; (1) Increase of food supply; (2) Distribution of food; (3) Organization of relief; (4) the strengthening of the staying power of the people. The first end may be achieved by irrigation, which increases the yield of cultivated areas in times of drought, or by extension of the area of cultivation through the reclaiming of uncultivated tracts. Irrigation has of course been carried out to a large extent, and further works are in progress. But the other and no less important method has been neglected. A hundred millions of acres are "declared to be waiting for cultivators." How to get the fifty millions of "degraded cultivators" to the acres awaiting them is a problem which Lord Dufferin's enquiry of 1888 in vain attempted to solve. "The net conclusion is that "private enterprise will effect the movement of the "people only on a small scale, and that the difficulties in the way of state-conducted migrations "on a great scale are almost insuperable." As long as the problem "continues to be discussed by the "revenue department, and in the spirit which "normally guides that department, little progress "seems likely." Private capital will, we are assured, be forthcoming to effect the much-needed re-distribution of population, but on reasonable conditions. One of these conditions, however, is a boon which a grasping and extravagant Government finds it impossible to grant, namely fixity of tenure. Much has been done it is true by private enterprise in one or two districts, notably the Dooars. "But for the "grudging policy of the Government, always with "one eye to the relief of its congested districts and "with the other eye to what it can itself make by "the transaction, these movements towards North-"Eastern Bengal would, it is said, have taken place "on even a larger scale." Only in the light of these facts is it permissible to talk of the over-population of India. "The over-population of great "areas in India has passed into a proverb." There is a saying which places a low estimate on the intelligence of quoters of proverbs. Obviously no district can be populated beyond the limits of its productive power in normal years. To argue that India is over-populated because in a year of drought these "congested districts" feel the pressure of famine is not less absurd than to argue that England is over-populated because wretches are found starved to death in the slums of big cities. Competent authorities affirm the existence of plentiful supplies of grain in India at the present moment. The difficulty is to bring it within reach of the hungry mouths at prices not altogether prohibitive.

This problem of distribution again subdivides. Railways have been and are still being constructed to facilitate the transport of food to population in accordance with the scheme drawn up twenty years ago. But the converse aspect, the redistribution of population, which is involved in the cultivation of hitherto uncultivated areas, has received very insufficient attention. Thus the Nagarkatta Road, which every year takes off 20,000 labourers from the congested districts of Bengal to

the tea gardens, could not be protected against floods because the revenues of the province had been confiscated at the end of the quinquennial period by the Imperial Government. "The case is merely an "example of how the free migrations of the people "are impeded and the action of British capital as a "preventive of famine is checked by a faulty system "of finance." Truly, what the Government does with one hand it undoes with the other. It has supervised the large migrations to Assam in the interest of the labourers with results that are said to be excellent, and encouraged and facilitated similar movements to Mysore, Ceylon, and Burma. These migrations within the limits of India, if conducted under favourable conditions, might amply suffice to dispel the baseless fears of over-population, that nightmare of Anglo-Indian economists. But finding that on the present scale internal migrations could not effect the necessary amelioration, Government has endeavoured to supplement them by encouraging the emigration of indented labourers to foreign countries and the British colonies. Yet on the other hand by starving the provincial administrations, and by permitting the colonies to prevent the immigration of Indian artisans, clerks, and the like, the Imperial Government puts a check on the action of its own remedial measures. As INDIA has already pointed out, there are vast districts in Africa which can only be developed by Indian labour, and many others which can be more economically served thereby. Free emigration would confer no less a boon on Africa than on India, and this consideration alone ought to guide the Imperial authorities to a decision, even if bare justice to our fellow subjects did not clearly indicate the only possible solution of the question between India and Africa. In truth, "an issue of more grave import was never placed "before the Imperial Government of Great Britain." While such incongruities in administration exist it cannot be considered sufficient that the elaborate Famine Code drawn up to provide for the third safeguard against famine should by grappling successfully with the difficulty of feeding four millions of destitute Indians deserve in the main the encomiums showered upon it. The delay in recognising the existence of famine, and the wilful ignorance of the authorities on certain points such as the loss of life by famine, are no faults of the Code, to which one ungrudgingly assigns all the praise due.

Finally the staying power of the people may be strengthened. "The staying power of a people "depends upon the normal prosperity of a people; "its prosperity on calling forth the material re-"sources of the country." Evidently therefore no single measure or series of measures can be proposed which shall secure the object in view. That can only be attained by a sound financial policy. To those who follow the vagaries of Indian finance it will be no surprise to find that this most important remedy against famine has received least attention. Such schemes as can be aired in Parliament, and pointed at as proofs of the earnest endeavours of the Indian Government to further by every means in its power the prosperity of the people, are energetically pushed forward, and money is always forthcoming. "When the most conscientious of Viceroys, Lord "Mayo, found it his duty in a great financial crisis "to suspend this conspicuous class of expenditure, "he exclaimed 'We have played our last card!'" But without the host of minor works which act as feeders to the great undertakings of the Imperial Government, the latter lose their efficiency, and some of the consequences are seen in the unprofitable working of some of the great railways. Political interests guarantee the performance of promises and plans which can be paraded in the eyes of the British public. But no such potent considerations ensure the efficient carrying out of provincial works, such as the making of roads and bridges, reclamation of waste ground, building of river embankments and the rest. These merely mean prosperity or poverty to the villager of the district in which they are carried out, or neglected for lack of funds. "The great interests—the com-"mercial interest, the steam navigation interest, the "railway interest, and the giant department of "Public works—take care that the Imperial ma-"chinery shall suffer no interruption. The not less "important provincial machinery is subject to a "series of rude checks and jars, and to being com-"pletely thrown out of gear whenever the Supreme "Government of India wants money." The comparison of the provincial governments to a sheep, which at the quinquennial census is "close clipped "and shorn of its wool and turned out to shiver till "its fleece grows again," has become deservedly famous. The provincial governments are unanimous in their condemnation of a system which has in its results so far diverged from the purpose of its originator. Parsimony and extravagance, the two most costly methods of conducting financial operations, are alternately encouraged. Whatever merits Lord Mayo may have perceived in his system have not been allowed to develop, thanks to the fatuous and extravagant military policy which was inaugurated some six years after the institution of the new method of arranging the quota of revenue assigned to the provincial governments. "Continuity is "essential to economic progress," and "we cannot "truthfully assert that the State has done all that "may be fairly expected of it to avert famine while "the whole machinery of district development, by "which alone the material resources of the country

"can be drawn forth and the staying power of the "people strengthened, is thrown out of gear for "the first half of each five years and carried on "during the second half in fear of the next dislo- "cation."

ALEXANDER THE GREAT.[1]

It has been the fate of Alexander, even more than of Hannibal, to furnish "a theme for declamation" to the schoolboys of successive generations. When and where his brilliant career and its abrupt ending first became a stock subject for moral and historical essays is a question which only admits of conjectural answers—perhaps in the schools of Alexandria, not very long after his death. But Livy had evidently written about him at school, and in mature life he set himself in highly academic fashion to discuss the probabilities of Alexander's defeat, if he had turned his arms against Rome. Quintilian gives specimens of the themes that he furnished to the Roman schools, and Hamlet apparently learnt to moralise on him at the University of Wittenberg. Coleridge, in his delightful reminiscences of his Christ's Hospital days, tells of the persistence with which some of his schoolfellows introduced him into their exercises, whatever might be the theme :

> "Was it ambition? Alexander and Clytus! Flattery? Alexander and Clytus! Anger? Drunkenness? Pride? Friendship? Ingratitude? Late repentance? Still, still Alexander and Clytus! At length the praises of agriculture having been exemplified in the sagacious observation that, had Alexander been holding the plough, he would not have run his friend Clytus through with a spear; this tried and serviceable old friend was banished by public edict in *saecula saeculorum*."

If Coleridge's "very sensible, though at the same "time very severe, master" came back to life, he would not find it necessary to re-issue his edict. Perhaps no more signal instance could be found of the breaking with the past in educational methods that has characterised the latter half of the nineteenth century than the fact that for the first time probably since the death of Alexander in 323 B.C., schoolboys are growing up in ignorance of his fame and achievements. The modern side boy barely hears his name; even the boy who is still taught on classical lines is apt to imagine that Greek history ended with the triumph of Sparta in 404 B.C., or at least with the death of Epaminondas in 362, and if he proceeds to Oxford, and reads Ancient History for "Greats," the chances are that he will be confirmed in the notion. If, however, he begins to read about Alexander for himself, he will be startled at the outset by a strange conflict of opinion. Demosthenes's description of Philip as "no Hellene, and "not even a respectable barbarian" is admittedly, and was, perhaps, felt to be at the time, a rhetorical exaggeration. But, whereas Grote could write of Philip's son that "in respect of disposition and "purpose no one could be less Hellenic," to the latest historian of Greece "he represents the "culminating point of Greek civilisation in his "achievements and in his character." After all our modern striving after historical impartiality, it is evident that we fail to escape from our own political bias. To Grote, Hellenism means Athens and the free institutions of Athens; he has all the old Greek hatred of despotism, and is almost ready, in consequence, to follow the lead of Thucydides in asserting that the tyrants achieved "nothing of importance." To Holm, Alexander is the forerunner of the German Kaiser of to-day, and Eumenes of Cardia, miscalled, Alexander's "chief Secretary," is really his Chancellor, his indispensable agent in the organisation of a great Empire. Edward Freeman's admiration for Alexander, which was unmistakeable, may seem somewhat surprising in an English Radical. It is explained by the fact that Freeman's imagination identified the Persians with the "unspeakable "Turk," and Alexander, their conqueror, with the champion of the Christian peoples of south-eastern Europe.

The difficulty of passing any just verdict on Alexander's life-work is largely increased by the inadequacy of the ancient records. For the fifth century we have Herodotus and Thucydides; for the first half of the fourth, Xenophon and the orators; but for Alexander's career we are left without contemporary guidance, and have to fall back upon Arrian, a respectable historian, but writing in the time of the Emperor Hadrian and without the help of modern canons of historical evidence. Still, out of the dimness certain points emerge fairly clear. First, his personal bravery and adventurous spirit are undoubted. So is a certain chivalry in his treatment of enemies of high rank, of Darius and his family and of Porus. This characteristic gives him some affinity to the favourite knights of the Middle Ages, and has largely contributed to his popularity. Again, his consummate generalship is undisputed. The only fault alleged against him as a general is that he was too careless of his own safety in the field. Philip has the credit of having organised the Macedonian army, with the "phalanx" that proved so terribly effective at Chaeronea; but Alexander's achievement of harmoniously combining very different elements in the same army, on a scale never attempted before, was at least as great. He saw that the strength of the Asiatics lay in their cavalry, and he beat them with their own weapon.

[1] "The History of Greece." By Adolf Holm. Translated from the German. Vol. III. (London: Macmillan and Co.)

Lastly, there is some agreement as to his possession of certain faults of character, though Holm minimises the evidence against him, omits to mention the massacre of the Branchidae, and thinks that his alleged drunkenness was only compliance with Macedonian custom and that the execution of Parmenio may not have been a judicial murder.

But when we pass from the consideration of his personal character and his purely military performances to estimate the lasting value of his work, the divergence of views between historians becomes extreme. To Grote he is a barbarian conqueror, the destroyer of the free city life of Greece, not the Helleniser of Asia but the Asiatiser of Hellas. Freeman finds in him the avenger of the wrongs of Hellas upon Persia, who is forced by the necessities of conquest into identifying himself with the Persian emperor whom he has overthrown, and who also betrays the inability to endure unmeasured success which had ruined so many Hellenes before him. With Holm he takes the place occupied by Julius Cæsar in Mommsen's history of Rome. He is the consummation of Greek history, the completer of the work that was only half done by Athens.

It is evident that different political principles are at the bottom of these diverse estimates. What is the best political gift the gods can give to the world? "A hero to rule over it"—We are all familiar with Carlyle's favourite answer. And if the actual flesh-and-blood conqueror approximated at all to the ideal hero, we might be ready to join in worshipping him. But in practice the conqueror is often so sadly unheroic, so much more of a destroyer than of a builder-up. Nor is it right to credit him with all the good results that may in the end have flowed from his upheaval of humanity. An earthquake, which spreads destruction through a country, may conceivably benefit it in the long run by altering its physical configuration; but it is not therefore a conscious moral agent, nor to be glorified as such.

By the spread of the Greek language through Western Asia, Alexander paved the way for Christianity, which was disseminated in the Greek tongue through the Asiatic centres of Greek culture. By breaking down the barrier between East and West, Alexander gave an impetus to commerce that must have had far-reaching effects in the civilisation of the world. In Alexandria he founded a city, whose importance as a centre of commerce and of culture cannot be exaggerated. But the first of these results was obviously wholly, and the second in great part, beyond his ken; it is perhaps only as the founder of cities and the geographical explorer of the far East that he deserves any large measure of the gratitude of humanity. If we try to set over against his services the sum of his evil doing, we involve ourselves in a question as problematical and academic as that which Livy propounded. Yet it is necessary at least to state it. What was the value of the free city life that he destroyed in Greece? If, as has been asserted, "there was more political life in a single "generation of a Greek city than in five or six "centuries of mediæval monarchy," does not the destruction of that life outweigh all the benefits with which he ought in fairness to be credited? The question can never be answered, because we can never know how much life still existed in the Greek states. That life may have been dying of exhaustion; Demosthenes had bitter complaints to make of the apathy of his fellow-citizens; but it is hard to believe that a city or a country was exhausted when it produced a Demosthenes.

INDIAN DELEGATES IN ENGLAND.

IMPORTANT CAMPAIGN IN THE CONSTITUENCIES.

ENTHUSIASTIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

The visit to this country of the Indian gentlemen selected to give evidence before the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure has been turned to admirable account by the British Committee of the Indian National Congress. Upon the arrival of Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer it was felt that such time as they could spare from the laborious duties connected with their evidence before Lord Welby's Commission would be best employed in conducting a campaign in the constituencies of the United Kingdom and explaining to British electors at first hand the trend of Indian opinion with regard to the problems of Indian administration.

There were, it is true, many circumstances which tended to discourage the project. For example, the season of the year was quite the most unsuitable for the purpose. Political meetings in the United Kingdom are confined as a rule to the months between October and March on account of the well-known difficulty of obtaining audiences during the cricket season. More than that, public attention, so far as it was not absorbed in athletics, was on this occasion occupied partly with the Græco-Turkish question abroad and with preparations for the "Diamond Jubilee" at home. It would, indeed, have been hard to find a less encouraging moment for an Indian campaign. Yet the British Committee resolved to make the most of the opportunity, and their efforts, backed by the indefatigable exertions of Mr. Surendra Nath, Mr. Wacha, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer, have succeeded beyond the most sanguine expectations. A circular, previously printed in INDIA, inviting public bodies, especially political associations, to arrange meetings, was widely distributed, and the response was in a marked degree favourable. The following table will

show at a glance the meetings which have been held :—

DATE.	PLACE.	SPEAKERS.
May 13.	Lambeth.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor Gokhale and Mr. Subramania Iyer.
,, 19.	Sunderland.	Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea.
,, 20.	Clapham.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea.
,, 23.	Belper.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Mr. H. N. Haridas, and Mr. J. P. Goodridge.
,, 25.	Mile End, London.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea and Mr. D. E. Wacha.
,, 26.	Hastings.	Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Professor G. K. Gokhale, and Mr. J. P. Goodridge.
June 3.	Dewsbury.	Mr. Subramania Iyer and Mr. K. N. Chaudhuri.
,, 4.	Dublin.	Mr. D. E. Wacha and Professor Gokhale.
,, 12.	Lewisham.	Mr. D. E. Wacha, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. Subramania Iyer.
,, 14.	Hackney.	Mr. D. E. Wacha and Professor Gokhale.
,, 16.	Gloucester.	Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. D. E. Wacha, and Professor Gokhale.
,, 20.	Acton.	Professor Gokhale.

In addition to the above, Professor Gokhale and Mr. Parameswaran Pillai are to address a meeting at Peckham on July 2.

Everywhere the Indian speakers have obtained a most enthusiastic reception. The audiences were delighted with their eloquent speeches and everywhere express a strong wish to hear the speakers again. Nothing could well be more encouraging than the sympathetic spirit which was shown on every side, and it goes without saying that this brief campaign will be followed up on a larger scale. One of the most important duties of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress is to carry into the British constituencies the war against the bad side of bureaucracy in India. When an Indian comes into contact with a British audience he realizes, as he has never done before, that, whatever may be the views of the governing classes in India or in London, the wrongs of Indians are hotly resented by the general mass of the British electorate.

We give below some extracts from the speeches delivered at the various meetings. Limits of space prevent us of course from attempting anything like a full report. But it may be noted that the meetings were on the whole well—in some cases remarkably well—reported in the newspapers.

MEETING AT LAMBETH.

Mr. J. Herbert Roberts, M.P., presided at the meeting held in the Wheatsheaf Hall, South Lambeth Road, on May 13. In addition to the speakers mentioned above there were also present Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Mr. W. S. Caine. We take the following from the speech of Mr Surendra Nath Banerjea :—

MR. SURENDRA NATH BANERJEA paid a generous tribute to British rule in India, the bright side of which, he said, the Indian people were by no means wishful to overlook. They were deeply grateful for its inestimable blessings. Great as had been British achievements in the arts and civilisation, they dwindled into nothing when compared with the services rendered to India, not least among which was to be reckoned the new impetus which had been given to public life in the Eastern Empire. But he had to complain that the Government of India was a Government conducted by officials for the benefit of officials, who added to their salaries at a time when the country was in financial straits, whereas an increase of 75 per cent. in the salaries of native officials, recommended ten years since, had not yet been made. In all matters connected with the Government of India the British people had a deep responsibility ; but they were too often heedless of the wants and woes of those whom they were called upon to rule. They did not inquire into the conduct of their officials, as was the case under the Honourable East India Company. He regretted the discontinuance of these scrutinies, and passionately prayed for their resumption by Parliamentary Committees. Everything possible ought to be done to remove the cause of famine in India—namely, the extreme poverty of its people. It had been an act of supreme wisdom on the part of the British nation to send relief to the famine-stricken, for by so doing they had effectually tightened the bond connecting the two peoples. The enormous military expenditure (this year £23,000,000) was sucking the blood of the Indian Empire. Already 70 millions had been spent on defensive works on the frontier, whereas the true scientific frontier lay in the hearts of a grateful and contented people. From his childhood he had heard of the coming "Russian invasion." If its day ever came, the people of India were ready to die in defence of their Sovereign. They knew what Russian domination meant for many of them—exile to Siberia and political extinction. After criticising the enormous sums credited to "home charges," the speaker animadverted on the great disproportion between the civil offices conferred on Europeans and those given to Indians, the latter having only 60, as compared with 900 held by English employees.

MR. DADABHAI AND MR. SURENDRA NATH AT SUNDERLAND.

"Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji," said the chairman at the Sunderland meeting on May 19, "had served Finsbury in the last House of Commons, and they could but hope he would serve some other constituency in the same place." We take the following from Mr. Dadabhai's speech :—

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI said that it was very important that the question of India should be thoroughly understood by the British people. The misfortune of India was that, while the British people were anxious that justice should be done to India, the authorities to whom the people delegated their power to govern India went upon a different line altogether, and it was this fact that they wished to impress upon the British people. It was laid down in 1833 that there should be no difference made in regard to any British subject by reason of race, creed, or colour. This was what Indians wanted ; to be treated equally with every other British subject ; that her people should be treated as British citizens, and not as British slaves. (Applause.) After the mutiny they had their great charter in the proclamation of the Queen, in which the same principle had been laid down with every emphasis, and that was at the Jubilee of 1887 confirmed. All this proved that, so far as British people and Parliament were concerned, they wished India to be governed on righteous principles, but the executive had fallen into a groove and could not get out of it. Lord Salisbury once said that the proclamations made with regard to India were only so much political hypocrisy. (Applause.) If England were subjected to the treatment India was subjected she would not stand it for one day, but would rebel against it. Let them suppose what it would be if all their departments—all their Government—were in the hands of foreigners, who carried away from the country

whatever they could save and whatever pensions they drew. The result must be that the country would be kept constantly bleeding and would eventually be bled to death. Two hundred million rupees were paid to European agencies year by year, of which nothing returned to India; nearly two-thirds of the revenue went out of the country. No country on the face of the earth was to-day poorer than India, and every year large numbers died from starvation. This was not creditable to British rule, and there was no reason why such a state of things should exist. If England were only just and honourable to India the benefit to herself would be ten times greater than it was to-day. If India could save to herself what she produced, she would, with the immense resources that the country possessed, be able to buy English goods to a greater extent than England would be able to supply them. In India Britain has an immense market of people who were civilised, when the inhabitants of these islands were roaming savages. (Laughter.) India was grateful for the lesson Britain had taught her, that the people were not created for the king, but that the king was the servant of the people; but in order to be subjects and not slaves they must have a voice in their own affairs; they must be governed on British principles, and not on despotic lines. India desired to feel that she was governing herself under the ægis and control and supremacy of Britain. He hoped they would use their influence in support of India's appeal. (Applause.)

Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, in the course of a speech which the *Sunderland Daily Echo* described as "most eloquent" and "magnificently eloquent," said that the Indian National Congress constituted the Liberal party in India. It was something like their own great Liberal Federation, only perhaps more thoroughly organised. When it first met in Bombay, in 1885, there were 75 delegates, and at the meeting in Calcutta last year there were 1,300. The party these delegates represented took their stand on the great principle of no taxation without representation, and as British subjects they claimed British citizenship, and asserted that their Government ought to be on strictly representative lines, and that the higher appointments ought not to have the exclusive monopoly of the ruling race. The Government of India was conducted by officials for the benefit of officials. He denounced the existing system of exchange allowances, and said that the duty of this country to India was not adequately performed by making it over to a body of officials into whose conduct no shadow of scrutiny was instituted. Many officials were his friends, and he esteemed them highly, but they were the victims of the system with which they were connected. India paid in home charges 24 millions a year, the whole of which left the country without any return of any kind, and that drain had been going on for the last fifty years. Charges which in the free-governing colonies were borne by the home executive were in regard to India drawn from the Indian Exchequer. They paid for the construction and maintenance of the India Office, but the home government built and maintained the Colonial Office. Among the charges which had been made on India was one by which she had been required to maintain a lunatic asylum in England. This, in consequence of protest, had been discontinued. There were 28,000 Englishmen against 11,000 natives drawing salaries from 1,000 rupees per year and upwards, and the Englishmen drew £15,000,000 and the Natives £3,000,000. Out of 960 covenanted appointments, 900 were held by Europeans and 60 by natives, and there were but 100,000 Englishmen in India and 300,000,000 natives. He pointed to the glorious history of the race to which he belonged, and asked for justice for the millions of his fellow-countrymen. Many of them had been taught to admire the writings of the great English masters of political philosophy, and had been fed upon the strong food of English constitutional freedom. England was about to celebrate the 60th year of the most glorious reign the world had ever witnessed. There could be no nobler celebration than by the practical recognition of the fact that the people of India were British subjects than by extending to them the British franchise, by conferring on them that heritage of civil rights and freedom which had made England what she was.

MEETINGS AT BELPER.

On Sunday, May 23, three meetings were held at Belper, Derbyshire, where Mr. H. N. Haridas, in conjunction with Mr. John Smedley, has for some time, and with conspicuous success, expounded "the Indian view of Indian questions." The speakers on May 23 included Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Mr. H. N. Haridas, and Mr. J. P. Goodridge. Mr. Surendra Nath, in the course of his speech, said:—

He was prepared to acknowledge many blessings which had been derived from that rule under which the dry bones of the valleys of India had become instinct with life, but at the same time he had not come there to sing their praises. Their official experts would do that; they were past-masters in the art, and speaking of the officials introduced him to one of the first of the grievances. Whilst the country was groaning under a load of taxation, these officials, whose salaries could be calculated by thousands of rupees, added to their salaries by what is known as the exchange compensation allowance. In spite of the disastrous famine which was raging these highly-paid European officials continued to draw this exchange compensation allowance. The allowance was made because of the reduced value of the rupee, and it cost the people of India a million and a half to make up that loss. But, whilst these European officials had this loss on the value of the rupee made up not a single native of India was entitled to the allowance. The native official might have his family in this country, he might be, many of them were, educating their families in this country, he might have to make remittances to this country, but all the same he was not entitled to the exchange compensation allowance. Those who made that invidious, insulting, and irritating distinction forgot that both races came from the same source. He maintained that the Government of India was conducted by officials for the benefit of officials, and as self-adulation was the law of Nature they could not blame those officials personally for giving to the English people their version of the government. But he was come to present the other side. Their primary grievance was that the people of England knew so little about the government of India, and, what was still worse, they cared so little about their great dependency in the East. They had a great and solemn and a consecrated trust which they had received from Providence, and that trust was not adequately performed by handing it over to officials into whose conduct they made not a shadow of enquiry. These officials were the irresponsible monarchs of all they surveyed.

MEETING AT HASTINGS.

The *Hastings and St. Leonards Times* printed a two-column report of the meeting held at Hastings on May 26, when the speakers were Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea, Professor Gokhale, and Mr. J. P. Goodridge, and the following resolution was carried:—

That this meeting rejoices in the existence of the Indian National Congress, and believes in the wisdom of conferring larger representative powers upon the people of our greatest dependency.

Professor Gokhale, in the course of his speech, said:—

They were perfectly sensible of the bright side of British rule, but they wanted their grievances redressed. (Applause.) He would take only the circumstances with regard to taxation and expenditure. One of the most fundamental principles of taxation was that necessities should not be taxed, and yet absolutely one of the primest necessaries of life was not only taxed but over-taxed. Two pounds of salt cost 2d. to manufacture, and on that there was a duty of 2s. 6d.—2,000 per cent. In England £10,000,000 was spent for education, but in India the sum was only half a million, and then the Government thought they are over-spending, and talked about cutting it down. Every child in this country attended school, but in his own country 88 or 89 out of every 100 were growing up in ignorance, and yet the Government said it was doing more than it ought to do. He was not exaggerating. In conclusion, he said they were often told that Indians were Englishmen, and the position had been taken up that the English Government and the Indian Government were in

partnership, but it reminded him of the partnership of the giant and the dwarf, where everything went to the giant, and the dwarf had what was left, and that was nothing, because the giant wanted it all. (Applause.) That sort of thing could not last long. Promises had beguiled them for so long —during the last 60 years nothing had been done. Lord Lytton had said that the promises were very inconvenient. If, however, Englishmen would realise their responsibility, things would be better, and the partnership between the two countries would be a real one. (Applause.)

Mr. Goodridge, after regretting that the speeches of their distinguished Indian visitors had not been delivered in the House of Commons, said that "he had returned from India three months ago, and the state of affairs as described by the previous speakers did not represent a tithe of what they really were. The people had been reduced to the last stage of poverty, and it was no exaggeration to say that they had died by thousands—they had died by tens and hundreds of thousands."

The question came—they had impoverished the country, how were they to improve it? It could only be done by reform and retrenchment. The taxes were not spent to improve the country, but, on the contrary, there was a large expenditure every two or three years on expeditions, and in that way the resources of the country were squandered. The administration was carried on in far too expensive and extravagant a style. An appeal had been made to the British people for help, but one would suppose that the Government would try to be as economical as possible that the country's own resources might supply the people in food and clothing; but the Government officials at the present moment were up amongst the hills of Simla, leaving the people in the plains to get on as best they could. What would Englishmen say if all the members of the Cabinet, all the judges, and the highest officials went away from the capital and spent eight months of the year in Scotland or four months in the Engadine and Switzerland? Simla was further away than the places he had mentioned. It was a shame—(applause)—at a time when they knew that the people of India were dying in such quantities; they could not know the feelings of the people or the sufferings they endured, while they were up in the hills of Simla.

MEETING AT GLOUCESTER.

A highly successful meeting was held at Gloucester on June 16. It was organised by the Gloucester Women's Liberal Association, and the speakers included Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P. (Chairman), Professor Gokhale and Mr. D. E. Wacha. An excellent report of the meeting was printed in the *Gloucester Journal* of June 19. Sir W. WEDDERBURN, having remarked upon the liberal way in which the county and city of Gloucester had contributed to the Indian Famine Relief Fund, said that

he was sure they would be glad to know not only how that suffering could be mitigated, but how they might strike at those causes which had made the suffering possible. He and others believed that with proper arrangements in India not only would famines be impossible, but that the country would be very prosperous indeed. There was a terrible famine in India 20 years ago, and the official record of deaths gave a total of five and a half millions. He regretted to say that a larger area was affected by the famine now raging, and they had yet to learn the terrible mortality that would result. If in time of peace such a calamity was possible, there must be something very wrong in the conditions of India. (Hear, hear.) There they had a vast population of frugal, industrious people —they were frugal and industrious in the highest degree— they had a very rich soil and a fine climate; and the people were very skilful cultivators and agriculturists. A country like that ought to be very wealthy indeed, and should produce conditions which would not only be beneficial to India but to the masses of this country who carried on trade with it. Instead of that, however, the people of India were so miserably poor that the failure of one harvest caused that terrible mortality. If they existed under reasonably good circumstances, or anything beyond a state of pauperism, they would be able to withstand the failure of one crop without dying of hunger. What they wanted to know was, what was the cause of that poverty, and the native gentlemen present, who now came to England for the first time, would deal with that question. Those gentlemen, who belonged to the educated class in India, were the product of our schools and colleges. One of the best things we had done for India—and he did not deny that much good had been done for the country —was to give it education. He regretted to say that the amount given for education was terribly niggardly, especially in comparison with the enormous sums spent upon useless and mischievous military extravagance; but something had been done in the way of education, and the result had been most beneficial. That education had raised up a class of men who were really the pillars and support of our administration there. Those educated men knew perfectly well that the only possible government for India at the present time was the British, and, therefore, they were strongly attached to the British Government; they knew that if the British Government left India to-morrow either anarchy would result or a despotic power like Russia would take possession of India. The best proof of the regard which the educated class had for British rule was their great desire to improve it, and make it more suited to the needs of the people. They desired to make it more sympathetic, so that the people might be made prosperous and contented; for until the people were made prosperous and contented there was no real, strong foundation in India for British rule. (Applause.) That criticism which pointed out the weakness of our rule was the best and most friendly support that such men could give to the Government of this country. He might say that the members of the Royal Commission upon Indian expenditure (to which he belonged) were most strongly impressed not only with the value of the evidence that was given by the gentlemen who attended as delegates from India, but by their moderate and reasonable tone, and the great knowledge of affairs which they showed. (Hear, hear.) Sir William concluded by dwelling on the great responsibility which the people of this country had with regard to India, and speaking of the necessity there was for the people to have a voice in the management of their own affairs.

Professor GOKHALE (who wore Indian costume) said in the course of his speech that:—

He would mention a few facts about the famine, and leave his hearers to draw their own conclusions. The first question that would strike people was as to why there should be such a famine in so vast a country after so many years of British government. Englishmen were very fond of saying that they gave the innumerable blessings of peace to India; and they all admitted that they had had peace. But if they had had peace for a hundred years, why should those famines come so frequently upon the land, and especially when it was acknowledged that the people were exceedingly frugal, industrious, and quiet? Let his hearers put the question to themselves, and he was quite sure it would not be easy for them to give an answer unless they went deeply into it. India at one time was entirely different from what it was now. Though the people were at the present time almost down to the lowest point of the wheel of fortune, at one time—many centuries ago—the country was the chosen abode of wealth, religion, philosophy, and all that went to make life happy. Long before anyone heard of Rome, Athens Babylon or Carthage, India was acknowledged to be the foremost nation in the world of civilisation; but it had gone down a great deal, and it was for the electors of Great Britain to consider whether it should always remain at the low point at which it now stood, or be raised up as had been so solemnly and so often promised. The question of the Indian famine must arouse interest in the Indian problem in this country in a very remarkable manner. He knew that the people of Gloucestershire had responded nobly to the appeal which was made to them, and on behalf of his country he tendered them his most sincere thanks. But, after all, when they had responded in that handsome manner, he must say they had not done the whole of their duty in the matter. The spectacle of a people suffering from starvation

like that which was witnessed in India, was something extraordinary; and if the ultimate responsibility for it came home to Great Britain, then surely the electors of this country ought to consider why it was that such a spectacle should be possible and whether there were any remedies by which that phenomenon might be prevented. . . . . The suffering that had been caused by the present famine was terrible. At the present time there were between three and four million people on the relief works, and for every man who went to them there were ten persons who were quietly suffering and dying at home, because, on account of caste distinctions they feared loss of status. He had visited some of the relief works and had seen skeletons there—men who were simply bundles of bones working from morning till eve under the scorching rays of the oriental sun—which would haunt him to the last day of his life. If his hearers were told that the Government had done and were doing so much, it must be remembered that that was only one side of the shield. No doubt the Government were doing something to relieve the sufferers, but it must not be forgotten that the famine was brought on, more or less by the Government's own action—by their unsympathetic administration of the laws. Merely palliating the effects of their unsympathetic administration did not get rid of their responsibility in the matter. Under normal conditions the life of the mass of the people was one of darkness and gloom; they had to toil and moil from dawn to dark, and many passed through life with an insufficiency of food. It had been estimated that between fifty and seventy millions never knew what it was to have their hunger fully satisfied from year's end to year's end. Their life was one of universal gloom, not cheered by a single ray of light or hope, and ultimately they became so desperate that they really did not care what happened to them. Even if they were able to save a little, there were the exactions of the Government and of the money-lender, so that what they put by was of no value to them.

Passing on to consider the remedies, Professor Gokhale said:—

With regard to the remedy, his hearers would agree that no people could be so well governed as by men who knew them well. The British rule had done a great deal of good for India, but a great deal more had been promised; and if those promises were faithfully and honestly carried out India would certainly have a great future, just as it had had a great past. It all depended on the manner in which the British nation carried out the promises which had been made to the Indian people. He admitted most unreservedly that the intentions of the Government were good—that the Government did not want the people to die by hundreds of thousands; and what was asked for was a fulfilment of the pledges so often made. The electors of this country were the ultimate arbiters of the destinies of the people of India, and yet they appeared never to give a moment's thought to Indian questions. It was not that they did not sympathise with their sufferings; India was not mixed up in their daily life. The electors of this country thought that there were people who were in charge of the Indian Government. As a matter of fact there were, and the result was they were living under a despotic and perfectly irresponsible government by Indian officials, whose interests were to take care of their own positions, who did not care so much for the welfare of the people, and did not care to know what the wants and wishes of the people were. Many of them even did not know the language, and did not mix with the people. The only remedy was to allow the people of the country to have a larger voice in the administration of its affairs. More than 60 years ago this country promised that the people of India should be raised to a level of equality with the other subjects of the British Empire; but if they considered the present situation, they would find there was all the difference in the world between the positions which the English and Indian subjects occupied. It was true they were both under British rule and the British flag, but beyond that there was very little in common between them. The children of the soil in India were merely hewers of wood and drawers of water. In questions of legislation and taxation they had practically no voice; their laws were made for them by officials.

Mr. D. E. Wacha, in the course of his speech, said that

the land revenue assessment was very high, and was beyond the ability of the cultivators of the soil. For the last hundred years the assessments had gone up higher and higher every time. The assessments were revised every 30 years, and whatever improvements the cultivator had made were, as it were, swept away for the benefit of the Government. Even the subsoil water was taxed. The cast-iron system of the Government, whereby the land revenue was demanded from the cultivator on fixed days, led to the most disastrous results in the case of the latter; if his crops were not ready and he could not pay, he was either sold up or he had recourse to the money-lender, and between the two he was ground down in such a way that his condition never improved. He (the speaker) had been reading an account of the progress which had been made during the 60 years in which the Queen had reigned; and, he asked, what had been the material condition of India—was it progressing? He said ruefully that it was deteriorating and going from bad to worse. There was no better illustration of that statement than the present famine. Former famines had come and gone, and, somehow or other, the cultivator was able for a time to resist the scarcity of food, and would only go to the relief works three months afterwards, perhaps; but this time, the moment it was known that there was a deficient rainfall people became apprehensive, and in the first or second week after the rains were over every one of the poorer classes had to go to the relief works. That fact showed the people had no staying power. The people were so poor that a little taxation was burdensome, whilst the ability to pay very heavy taxes was hardly to be found anywhere. Having given instances of the oppressive character of the salt tax, Mr. Wacha showed how the land had become poorer and poorer by reason of manure being used for fuel since the forests had been reserved by Government, and remarked on the large military expenditure, the greater portion of which for the last ten years had been on fruitless and unrighteous wars. Those little military scares on the borders were pure myths, and vast sums of money were spent on those "frontier fireworks." The natives of India would be quite contented with British rule if only the Government would be more in sympathy with them and relax their oppressive laws. But whilst so much money was spent on military matters domestic reforms were neglected. The great black spot in the administration of the country was the land laws, which greatly needed amendment. The interests of India were indissolubly bound up with those of Great Britain, and it was to the electors of this country that the natives looked for justice.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON AND THE INDIAN DELEGATES.

The following appeared in the *Standard* of May 24th:—

The Secretary of State for India has had his attention drawn by a correspondent to the statements made by four native gentlemen, delegates of the Indian National Congress, at a public meeting recently held at Lambeth, with a view to rousing the people of the United Kingdom to the preception of the grievances under which, it was alleged, the native population of India are suffering. The reply of the Secretary of State to the communication of his correspondent was as follows:—

"India Office, Whitehall, S.W., 21st May, 1897.

"Dear Sir,—I regret not to have leisure to discuss at length the various topics raised in your letter of the 14th, but I would point out that there is nothing in the criticisms you mention which really touches the fundamental principle on which the Government of India is based. This principle is that the British authority is responsible for the protection of the country from external attack, and for the maintenance of internal order; and so long as this responsibility rests with the British authority it is impossible for any Government to take steps either as to the frontier policy or the organisation of the internal administration of the country, which would be inconsistent with the discharge of its fundamental obligations. To withdraw the forces on the frontier or to introduce a system of representative government would be fatal to the external safety of the country and the maintenance of order internally. As to your specific questions, I send the following answers:—

"1. The home charges represent the interest on the capital

invested in India, the pensions, etc., of the officers who have given their lives to the service of India, and the value of such stores as cannot be procured in that country. It also includes the cost of the system of the Home Government, established by the Act of 1858. Without British capital and without British officers India, as we know it, would cease to exist.

"2. As to India being the poorest country in the world as the result of the "salt and income taxation," it is sufficient to point out that, taking the present value of the rupee at 1s. 3d., the incidence of the salt tax per head of the population at 4½d. to 5d. per annum, and that out of a total revenue from taxation of about £18,500,000 (being at the rate of less than 1s. 7d. per head per annum), only £1,156,000, or a little more than one penny per head is derived from income-tax, from which, moreover, the poorer classes are exempt. As a matter of fact, India judged by the standard of other Asiatic countries, is not a poor country. For instance, the imports of gold on private account, and not for purposes of coinage, during the last ten years, have averaged annually more than £2,500,000.

"3. The reason why India pays for the cost of the home Government is, apart, from questions of policy, that there is no reason why the taxpayer in this country should be called upon to bear this burden, while India is financially perfectly able to bear the charge herself.

"4. As to the cost of lunatics charged to Indian revenues, I must point out that the net charge in 1896-97 was £4,600, and not £30,000, as you have been informed. I am unable to see why, if pensions are to be given, as I think they should be, to officers incapacitated for further duty by injuries or disease contracted during service in India, those whose disability takes the form of insanity should not receive a suitable provision. Under the present system, lunatics are pensioned in the same way as all other officers invalided; but under the rule of the East India Company (which was abolished by the Act of 1858) special provision was made for lunatics, and the net charge of £4,600 mentioned above is incurred in fulfilling the engagements of the East India Company.

"In conclusion, I must express the opinion that it is useless to eulogise in the abstract the blessings of British rule in India, and then propose to destroy that which alone makes British rule possible and beneficent.—I am, yours faithfully,

(Signed) "GEORGE HAMILTON."

The following reply, which the newspapers with a curious notion of fair play appear to have boycotted, was forwarded to Lord George Hamilton:—

Hotel Victoria, London,
May 28th, 1897.

To The Right Honourable LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, Secretary of State for India.

My Lord,—Our attention has been called to a letter signed by your Lordship which appeared in the *Standard* of Monday last, regarding certain criticisms which we had ventured to make at a public meeting at Lambeth, in connexion with the present system of Administration in India. The views which we put forward at that meeting are shared by the educated classes in India, and they deserve earnest and careful consideration on the part of those who are responsible for the good government of that country.

Your Lordship seems to be of opinion that the reforms which our educated countrymen recommend would be inconsistent with the fundamental policy of the British Government in India, which is the maintenance of internal peace and the protection of the country against external aggression. We desire respectfully to join issue with your Lordship in this matter, and we are firmly persuaded that if the reforms which the Congress advocate were given a fair trial, the great objects which the present policy of the Government professes to secure would be far more effectively promoted. It need hardly be observed that any policy which promotes general contentment and satisfaction will secure internal peace and ensure security against foreign aggression in a better sense than any system based upon mere military force.

There are some obvious misapprehensions in your Lordship's letter with regard to what was said at the meeting, and the general views of the Congress party in connexion with the forward frontier policy of the Government. Nobody has suggested the withdrawal of the troops from the *natural* frontiers of India, but we protested at the meeting against the recent extensions of the frontiers, which in the opinion of several competent military critics, unconnected with the Government of India, have not only weakened the natural defences of the country, but have seriously dislocated our finances, pledging us moreover to vast and undefined liabilities in the future.

Further, at the meeting it is true that considerable stress was laid upon the poverty of the Indian masses, but nobody even suggested that it was the *result* of the Salt Duty and the Income Tax. As regards the Salt Duty, it was observed that being a tax upon a prime necessity of life, it was open to grave objection, which was accentuated by the fact that the Duty on Salt is at present 2000 per cent. of the cost of production, and that therefore it was most oppressive in its incidence on the poorest of the poor; and in this view of the matter we need quote no better authority than your Lordship, who, two years ago, admitted in the House of Commons the extreme hardship entailed upon the people by the salt tax, and therefore it is with no little surprise that we now read what appears to be something like a vindication of the salt duty.

As regards the Income Tax, what was insisted upon at the meeting was that the taxable minimum was too low, being about £30 a year, and that it should be raised. When it is borne in mind that in England the taxable minimum is £150, it will be readily conceded that the suggestion is not an unreasonable one. No doubt considerable stress was laid upon the increasing Home Charges. We felt that in doing so, we only represented Indian sentiment, which was indeed largely shared by the Anglo-Indian community.

Your Lordship will perhaps remember the trenchant and incisive criticism which Sir Griffith Evans made from his place in the Supreme Legislative Council in connexion with many of the items included in the Home Charges.

As Sir George Wingate remarked in connexion with these Home Charges:—

"The taxes spent in the country in which they are raised are totally different in their effect from the taxes raised in one country and spent in another. . . . . In this case, they constitute no mere transfer of one portion of the national income from one set of citizens to another, but are an absolute loss and extinction of the whole amount drawn from the taxed country."

If the Home Charges are incurred to meet, among other things, the cost of stores purchased in this country, and to pay for pensions in respect of ser-

vices rendered in India, it is not difficult to see what the remedies would be. The employment of a larger indigenous agency in the public service of India would reduce the pension charges paid in this country. The purchase of stores in India to a greater extent than is the case at present would go far to diminish the charges under this head in this country.

In conclusion, we desire to call attention to the remark which your Lordship has been pleased to make to the effect that it is no use our extolling British Rule when we seek to destroy everything which can make that rule possible and beneficent. We desire to point out that we regard the British connexion as being highly beneficial to India, but our complaint is that the form of government which exists now in India prevents the people from reaping the fullest benefits to be derived from that connexion.

The Congress party seek to remove those features in British Indian Administration which interfere with its usefulness and beneficence. If the British connexion is to be permanent, as we pray it will be, the government must cease to be a military despotism—its foundations must be shifted and its policy and its principles must be in harmony with popular ideals, hopes, and aspirations. This is the great work which the Congress has set before it, and in this work it confidently appeals to the sympathies of all Englishmen, no matter to what party they may belong.

We have the honour to be,
Your Lordship's Obedient Servants.

Surendra Nath Banerjea,
Member, Bengal Legislative Council, and Secretary, Indian Association, Calcutta.

D. E. Wacha,
Joint General Secretary, Indian National Congress, and Secretary, Bombay Presidency Association.

G. Subramania Iyer,
Delegate, Mahajana Sabha, Madras.

G. K. Gokhale,
Secretary, Deccan Sabha, Poona.

INDIA AND THE DIAMOND JUBILEE.

The following letter appeared in the *Times* of June 7th:—

To the Editor of the *Times*.

Sir,—Will you permit me, through your columns, to ask whether the British people do not desire that this auspicious year should, if possible, be made an occasion of rejoicing to the millions of their fellow-subjects in India? The people of India cherish a strong personal attachment to her Majesty. For the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 is regarded by them as the Magna Charta which pledges the British Government to a just and sympathetic rule; and they will never forget that in personally directing the terms of that Proclamation she used these gracious words:

"The Queen would be glad if Lord Derby would write it himself in his own excellent language, bearing in mind that it is a female Sovereign who speaks to more than a hundred millions of Eastern people on assuming the direct government over them, and after a bloody civil war giving them pledges which her future reign is to redeem, and explaining the principles of her government. Such a document should breathe feelings of generosity, benevolence, and religious toleration, and point out the privileges which the Indians will receive in being placed on an equality with the subjects of the British Crown and the prosperity following in the train of civilisation."

Further assurances of goodwill were conveyed to the Indian people at the Jubilee of 1887. And this occasion of the Diamond Jubilee offers an opportunity altogether unique and becoming for striking the imagination and kindling anew the affection of a quick-witted and impressionable people, by associating with the name of their gracious Sovereign some great boons which will never be forgotten. The present suffering state of the Indian masses is an additional reason for such bold and statesmanlike action. In painful contrast with the exuberant prosperity of her other dominions, India lies prostrate under famine and pestilence. Is this not a time specially indicated for motherly solicitude and an attempt to console and cheer countless desolated homes?

Doubtless her Majesty's advisers will propose the conferring of personal honours upon individuals. But I trust they will not consider that their duty on so great an occasion ends here. Such personal honours, if bestowed on those Indians whom their fellow-countrymen regard as their friends, will, no doubt, be welcomed in India. But what is now wanted is something more real. To bind India closer to this country requires boons which will benefit the masses, which will tend to their progress and well-being, political and social, moral, material, and intellectual. Ten years ago the Jubilee assurances were followed by an expansion of the Legislative Councils; and thus, by tentatively introducing the representative element, the voice of Indian public opinion was allowed to make itself heard in the making of Indian laws. This reform has produced nothing but good. Why not go a little further on these safe and practical lines? Again, the cultivating classes are now in the deepest depression and suffering. Why not strengthen their feeble knees by granting them fixity of tenure and limitation of the Government demand, as recently advocated in your columns? This would give them new life and be a permanent benefit to the country. By the great educated class, by whom three generations have grown up in our schools and colleges, and who control public opinion in India, no grievance is more felt than their exclusion from high and honourable office in the service of their own country. Why not, in this matter, give practical effect to her Majesty's assurances in the Proclamation of 1858, that all her subjects shall equally be granted the public employment for which they show themselves fitted? Lastly, the Indian people desire that the old practice should be revived of periodical enquiries into Indian administration, as it is from these

enquiries that date all the principal measures which have tended to the contentment and prosperity of the people.

I hope and trust that these considerations are occupying the mind of her Majesty's advisers. Lord Salisbury, with Lord Iddesleigh, by the restoration of Mysore did a great work, strengthening our position in India. Will he not, as Prime Minister, rise to the present great occasion and advise her Majesty to signalise the Diamond Jubilee by some striking mark of her confidence in and benevolence towards the millions of her Indian subjects?

I have, etc.,

W. WEDDERBURN.

House of Commons, May 31.

A conference of Indians resident in the United Kingdom was held on Saturday, June 12th, at Montague Mansions (facing the British Museum). The object of the gathering was to consider and adopt a congratulatory address to her Majesty Queen Victoria, Empress of India, on the occasion of her "Diamond Jubilee." The London Indian Society, with whom the idea originated, succeeded in bringing together many Indian ladies and gentlemen now residing in this country. The meeting was presided over by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

The CHAIRMAN, who was very cordially received, said that they as Indians had a great deal to thank her Majesty for in regard to the influence she had exercised on their behalf. (Cheers). Four years before her Majesty came to the throne an Act was passed giving them certain rights of citizenship, which they, in its altered form, regarded as their Magna Charta. During the Queen's reign she made the charter far more powerful and extensive than it was under the original Act of 1833. (Hear, hear.) That Act merely provided that British subjects should be treated without regard to class, creed or colour in respect of the service of his Majesty, who then reigned; but the proclamation of the Queen in 1858 included not only the British, but the Indian subjects. (Cheers.) Throughout the whole of India the prince and the peasant had gracious pledges given them, and with this righteous Act her Majesty's name would remain joyfully associated for ever. (Cheers.) The Magna Charta of India was given graciously and spontaneously by the Queen. (Hear, hear.) It was one of the brightest episodes in British Indian history that her Majesty had taken an important part in carrying out the pledges given in the charters in reference to the restoration to Mysore of a native prince, and Mysore was now a flourishing native state. They had great reason to be thankful to her Majesty, and on this most glorious occasion they might reasonably ask for some further exhibition of the loving care which she had always manifested towards them.

An address had been drawn up by the executive committee of the London Indian Society, and the chairman moved its presentation.

Mr. T. J. DESAI, in moving the adoption of the address, in a short and eloquent speech said that British rule was endeared to the Indian mind. He hoped that the two countries would be brought closer together every day in the bonds of fellow-feeling and mutual attachment.

Mr. H. S. KHALIL seconded the motion, which was ably supported by Mr. D. E. WACHA, delegate from Bombay, Professor G. K. GOKHALE, from Poona, and Mr. G. SUBRAMANIA IYER, from Madras. The resolution was carried amidst loud and prolonged cheers.

Mr. S. Z. A. BALKHI moved that the chairman be authorised to sign the adopted address on behalf of the conference. The motion was seconded by Mr. H. MULLICK and then unanimously carried.

Mr. N. B. CHATTERJI moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was passed with cordial cheers, and the proceedings terminated.

We add the text of the address adopted at the conference:—

ADDRESS

To Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, and Empress of India, etc., etc.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY—

WE, the Indians resident in the United Kingdom, in public conference assembled, loyal and loving subjects, rejoicing in the approaching sixtieth anniversary of your Majesty's accession to the Throne, desire to approach your Majesty with our most devoted attachment and heartfelt congratulations on this great and auspicious occasion.

WE recall with gratitude the gracious words of your Majesty's Proclamation of the 1st of November, 1858, which we regard as the Magna Charta of our rights, spontaneously granted by a beneficent Sovereign for the good of her people. Your Majesty was then graciously pleased to declare that you held yourself bound to us by the same obligations of duty that bound your Majesty to all your other subjects; and in 1887, on the occasion of your Jubilee, your Majesty reiterated your generous pledges.

THUS your Majesty's assumption of the Government of India was rendered memorable by the issue of the glorious Proclamation of 1858, and on the auspicious occasion of the Jubilee of 1887, by a small expansion of the Legislative Councils—introducing a partial representation in them—which gave to the people an opportunity of making known their needs and aspirations. We now, therefore, at the Diamond Jubilee, approach your Majesty's Throne with the prayer that your Majesty will be pleased to celebrate this unique occasion by the bestowal of some further marks of the loving care of your Majesty for your Indian subjects, and crave permission to indicate briefly the boons which we believe would be most gratifying to the Indian people.

HAVING regard to the success which has attended the practical working of the generous concession, by which the representatives of the people are partly associated in the making of their laws, we humbly pray that this noble policy may be still further extended by so increasing the numbers of the representative members of the Councils, that the different Provinces of this vast Empire may be adequately represented—by giving them a larger voice in the Financial Legislation of the country—and so improving their status as members of the Councils, that they may render still more effective aid to the Government in their labours for the welfare of the people.

FURTHER, we recall with gratitude the gracious words of Your Majesty's Proclamation:—"And it is Our further will that, so far as may be, Our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in Our Service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge." And we pray that in accordance with this expression of Your Majesty's benificent intentions, the Resolution of the House of Commons of the 2nd of June, 1893, bearing on this subject, may be given effect to, with

a view to the wider employment of the people of India in the service of their own country.

AGAIN, looking at the terrible suffering entailed by Famines in India, we pray that the cultivators may be granted the boon of fixity of tenure and legislative limitation of the Government demand, in order to give them courage and confidence in the pursuit of their industry.

FINALLY, looking to the fact that India has no representatives in the Imperial Parliament, and in order that Your Majesty may, from time to time, be fully informed of the condition and needs of Your Majesty's subjects in India, we pray that You may be graciously pleased to revive the former practice of holding periodical Parliamentary Enquiries into Indian affairs, a practice which in the past has been fruitful of good results.

AND WE PRAY to the Almighty Giver of all good that Your Majesty may long be spared to reign over Your people in Your world-wide Empire.

ANGLO-MUHAMMADAN LAW.[1]

These volumes constitute one valuable part of the outcome of Sir Roland Wilson's fourteen years' tenure of the Readership in Indian Law at Cambridge. It argues not only diligence in his academic office, but also a strong interest in the subject, that he should have undertaken to set forth in a plain exposition the complexities of such a difficult and far-off branch of the law. To our mind, he has succeeded in far larger measure than any of the writers that have attempted to deal similarly with the Hindu law; but it is to be remembered that their task is a vastly more complicated and extensive undertaking. He also appears to us to have handled the material with more efficiency than any of his predecessors in the same line; perhaps because he has brought to the work a more powerful scientific equipment, and a deeper grasp of legal principle and practice. Though placed at some disadvantage by lack of familiarity with Indian life at first hand, he still seems to have entered into the situation in a manner creditable to his sympathetic insight. It is further unfortunate that he should not have been able to address himself to the legal works of Muhammadan law in the original texts; but it may be hoped that, in so far as he has fallen short on this fundamental ground, the deficiency may be made up by some competent native scholar, either in the form of particular criticisms or in an independent work covering the whole ground. These able volumes, at all events, offer a fair and worthy challenge. They do immense credit to the author, and such credit is reflected upon the University of Cambridge.

Sir Roland Wilson proposed to himself to remedy two deficiencies. There was, he thought, "first, a lack of suitable introductory matter, to smooth the path of the beginner who approaches the subject with the ordinary intellectual outfit of English law-students; and secondly, insufficient recognition of the curiously composite character which the so-called Muhammadan law of modern India, has gradually come to assume under European manipulation." To the first point is directed, in the main, the historical "Introduction" first-mentioned above; the second is provided for in the "Digest," which deals with the law in precise and detailed form, so as to meet the requirements of advanced students and practitioners. Looking then, in the first place, to the interests of students, and in the second place, to the desirableness of forwarding the work of Indian codification, the author has aimed at "directing attention simply and solely to what the British Government at the present time requires to be enforced as law for its Muhammadan subjects, and for them alone; falling back on the Muhammadan authorities, translated or untranslated, only where the point has not yet been covered by legislation or judicial decision." It is essential to note definitely the limitations thus laid down. They are undoubtedly just limitations, and they weaken very sensibly the regret that the author finds it necessary to disclaim knowledge of Arabic and original research. For in order to the determination of a civil suit in Muhammadan cases in British India, the original sources have ceased to be, as a rule, the most important. Thus, Sir Roland Wilson says:—

> "The Courts are bound to accept the inferences drawn from the Koran and the traditions in the standard medieval text-books in preference to what might appear to the judges a more correct inference. But, again, the secondary medieval sources are of less weight (for the purpose aforesaid) than the previous practice of the Courts of British India. In other words, a judge is not at liberty to decide a point of law according to his own reading of a medieval Muhammadan treatise (the Hedaya, for instance) in opposition to a single decision of the Privy Council, or to a series of decisions of the High Court which he represents or to which he is subordinate."

The scope of Sir Roland's "Anglo-Muhammadan Law," then, is materially different from the scope of Sir Syed Ameer Ali's "Mohammadan Law, compiled from authorities in the original Arabic." He puts the position very clearly in a single sentence:—

> "British statesmanship determines from time to time how much of Oriental precept is to be treated as Law in the English sense, how much left to the consciences of those who acknowledge it as religiously binding, how much forcibly suppressed as noxious and immoral; and when this has been determined, European scholarship sifts and classifies the Oriental authorities, the mental habits of English and Scotch lawyers influence the methods of interpretation, and Procedure Codes of modern European manufacture regulate the ascertainment of the facts and the ultimate enforcement of the rule."

And when he speaks of scholarship and lawyers as above, he means to include native scholars and native lawyers that follow European methods; which, it may be added, not a few of them do with conspicuous ability.

The historical volume starts with Mahomet and the Koran. Before the Prophet's time there was little government and still less law among the Arabs, individual or tribal aggressiveness being dealt with by social agencies—religion, public opinion, and the natural disposition of the peaceful and fair-minded. The Koran itself is well described by Sir Roland as "a religious miscellany with some legislative matter embedded in it"; and there is much room for

[1] "An Introduction to the Study of Anglo-Muhammadan Law." By Sir Roland Knyvet Wilson, Bart., M.A., LL.M. "A Digest of Anglo-Muhammadan Law." By the same Author. (London: W. Thacker and Co.)

development of the interesting contrast between the course of such a composite and final code and the course of the Roman Decemviral code, which had already severed religion from law and left the door wide open for the future. "The promulgation of the Koran by Abu Bekr," then, "was substantially the act of an organised political society, imposing rules of conduct upon each and all of its members, to be enforced in case of need by its collective physical force." The post-Koranic development takes two lines—orthodox and unorthodox. Sir Roland traces in the orthodox (Sunni) line the growth of the jurists, the Maulawis, or professional expositors of the Shariat, a class curiously analogous to the Roman *iurisprudentes*, and pursues in some detail the divergencies of the rival schools of the Moslem *ulama*—the Kanafi, Maliki, Shafai, and Hanbali—concluding this section of his narrative with an account of the Hedaya, as representing "the orthodox view of the Sacred Law at the period of its fullest maturity and approaching decay." He appends to this section an interesting enquiry as to the juristic character of Muhammadan Law from the point of view of Austin's analysis of Law and Sovereignty. The unorthodox line of development brings under consideration the Motazalas (separatists) and more especially the Shias. The next stage is the application of Muhammadan law in India under Muhammadan rulers, the pre-eminent point being the series of reforms engineered by Akbar, with the reaction commenced under Jehangir and Shah Jahan and completed under Aurangzib. This brings us at last to the history and present footing of Anglo-Muhammadan Law, under a professedly Christian Government. Considerable space is devoted to the Patna case, which read emphatically the lesson that "the law to be administered to the natives of Bengal must be accommodated to their habits and expectations, and must not be simply English law transplanted whole." It needs an English headstrongness to give such a preposterously elementary principle an opportunity for contested enforcement. There is no necessity to follow here in detail the various steps of this historical development.

It remains only to express sympathy with Sir Roland's urgent advocacy of the official codification of the Anglo-Muhammadan Law. Happily there is no reason to suppose that there would be the least popular objection: on the contrary, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan many years ago declared in the Legislative Council at Calcutta that there was a general desire in favour of the step among the native population. Our Anglo-Indian adminstrators can hardly be so stupid as to lay stress upon the exploded notion that a code stereotypes the law in cast-iron. They have had personal experience to the contrary, besides what they ought to know of the history of the Roman and French codes. The present "Digest" of Sir Roland Wilson's drafting would form a most substantial and important groundwork, calculated to facilitate indefinitely the labours of a Commission. It would be futile to deal with particular points here. Let it suffice to say that we have tested it at numerous crucial points and found it ring true. Both the "Introduction" and the "Digest" have evidently been composed with uncalculated labour and care, and must prove immensely serviceable for the purposes for which they were specifically designed. The results are sharply conceived and lucidly expressed. Even a layman with a little legal *penchant* would find a variety of curious interest in the multifarious problems of discussion.

A STRONG-MINDED HINDU.—II.

By W. Martin Wood.

Vishvanath's special civic service began with the modern Corporation of Bombay, established by Sir Bartle Frere in 1865. This was a nominated body, at the head of which was a Civilian Commissioner appointed by the Government, who had, in effect, all the financial and executive power in his hands, leaving only review and criticism for the members. In this duty the Rao Sahib was prominent from the first. After a few years' trial that system broke down; and in 1872 a reformed Corporation, including a Town Council, was established on something like the European plan, with a considerable elective element. Vishvanath was an elected member of this body from first to last, and he was chosen Chairman (something like our mayors) of the Council, which position he occupied in 1879, during Sir Richard Temple's term as Governor, though he had strongly opposed certain measures which Sir Richard forced on the city. The civic courage and vigilance he displayed all through these fifteen years were such as would have done credit to any of our municipal leaders in this ancient land of burgesses and civic freedom. The story of these struggles and services is a long one; but the Rao Sahib's bearing through it all is admirably summarised by his biographer—in terms which the present writer can confirm from close personal observation:—

> "He performed his duties with an independence, an even-handed impartiality; and yet with an overflowing courtesy which elicited for him the respect and admiration of his colleagues, European and Native alike. His whole work in the municipality was, indeed, a noble record of which anyone could be proud."

Abundant testimony to this effect was given on the day of his death, when, as a mark of respect, the Corporation adjourned after passing a unanimous resolution recording its sense of the loss sustained. The chairman, in moving the resolution, remarked *inter alia*:—

> "He was a steady and consistent advocate of wise reform, and did much to advance the cause of local self-government. When the Municipal Act of 1872, which widened the business of self-government in this city, was drawn up, he was consulted, and his advice was of considerable service."

In seconding the resolution, Dr. Blaney—who had in this work been associated with him all through—after testifying to the earnestness and self-sacrificing public labours of the departed councillor, said:—

> "All the votes he ever gave, all the speeches he ever made in this Corporation, were for the progress of municipal institutions, and for the working of local self-government with success. In this respect he truly seemed to me to possess the spirit of an Englishman."

In 1874, in (the late) Sir Philip Wodehouse's time,

he had entered on the wider stage of public life, being selected as a member of the Legislative Council of the Bombay Presidency, which position he thrice occupied to the great satisfaction of the whole community of Western India. It is said of him in that capacity—

"We see how he became a model 'guardian' of the interests of the people in the Council. Prominent in 'Opposition' as he was, he possessed the esteem of his official colleagues, who could never possibly hope to cow him down to meek obedience or cringing acquiescence. An attempt of this kind was once made by a Governor too well known for his impulsiveness to require special mention [Sir R. Temple], and in answer he [the said President of Council] was politely requested to remember that he was no longer in the Central Provinces."

In 1884 Vishvanath was called up by the Marquis of Ripon to the higher stage of the Supreme Legislative Council. Being the first Indian from the Western Presidency who had received that honour, it was recognised as such to themselves by his fellow-citizens, who gave him a public entertainment at which were represented, as he acknowledged, "all the leading members of the communities of Bombay." It was presided over by Sir Jamsetji Jijibhai. In his speech of congratulation to the Rao Sahib, the Parsee baronet, after expressing the general satisfaction that the right of that Presidency to be represented in the Viceregal Legislative Council had at length been recognised, said that satisfaction had been greatly enhanced, and that such recognition

"had found its fulfilment in the selection of so worthy and qualified a representative as yourself. . . . . In your nomination we recognise the sincere desire of Lord Ripon's Government to call to his Council real representatives of the people—men, like yourself, who can render useful service to the public cause. Your nomination is thus as honourable to those who have made it as it is honourable to yourself, and is gratefully appreciated by all classes of the people."

On Vishvanath's journey eastward he was welcomed at Nasik and other stations on the way, and his arrival at Calcutta was the occasion of an enthusiastic demonstration by the Indian associations of that city. It was under the Marquis of Ripon that he had been appointed to the Supreme Legislature in 1884, and in 1886 he was nominated under Lord Dufferin. During this comparatively brief period of work in the chief legislative chamber of India he, as is remarked in the memoir, "fulfilled the expectations raised of him; he fully justified his selection, and won laurels fresh and glories new." But it would require an exposition of his treatment of the Bengal Tenancy Bill, the Local Government Act, and the Income-Tax measure to do justice to the painstaking and discrimination shown by the Rao Sahib in bringing his extensive experience to bear on those difficult subjects, and such expositions cannot be entered upon here. His attitude in dealing with the former of these measures might be taken as illustrating at once the solidity and reasonableness of his character as a public man. Himself a landholder (a Khote of the Konkan), he was a tenacious defender —occasionally to excess, as some of us used to think—of proprietary interests in land; but in his trying labours on the protracted Tenancy Bill discussions he was careful to respect the claims of the cultivating rayats, and met the demands of the tenant-right cultivators of Bengal in that spirit of compromise and desire for abatement of friction which was characteristic of the practical statesman. At one of the critical stages of this legislative struggle, he said:—

"My lord, I am quite sensible of the imperfections which there may be in my work; but I can assure your lordship and my colleagues that I have devoted more hours to it than one is usually credited with doing in this climate. If there are any sides of the question on which more light can be thrown, nobody would be more glad to learn than myself; but I have a right to say that I have done my best under the circumstances."

The occasion of his retiring from the Legislature was not neglected by the Rao Sahib's fellow-citizens in December, 1887. At a large meeting held at the Petit Hall, Sir Dinshah, who presided, in his opening remarks, said of him:

"He has all along possessed the confidence of the people and the Government and has discharged his duty by both in a remarkably able, effective, and independent manner."

The leaders of the Banian community also testified to the same effect. It was resolved to found a permanent memorial to Vishvanath's name and public services. This was done by the subscription of a considerable fund establishing an annual prize of a gold medal, to be awarded by the University of Bombay, to the best essay connected with Sanskrit literature; also for a bust placed in the Hall of Convocation. This is a peculiarly suitable memorial—the Rao Sahib being connected with the University from its earliest active existence; his name stands as first of its scholastic Fellows under the date of 1862. As member of the Senate, Syndic, and Examiner he was identified with the University to the last. Sir Raymond West, as Vice-Chancellor in 1888, said of him,

"His name is to remain for ever on the golden book of this Institution. He will be enshrined amongst its best and most deserving men, uniting within himself the attributes of a Sulpicius, a Varro, and a Mæcenas, with the fame of them all."

It is not for me here to express any opinion on, but this is the place to mention, the Rao Sahib's great work on that part of the Hindu Civil Law which obtains in western India and other Mahratta provinces. It consists of Yajnyawalkya's "Smitri" and Nilakantha's "Vyawahara-Mayukha." These volumes comprise, besides the Sanskrit text carefully edited by Vishvanath, a clear English translation, with an introduction which in itself forms a comprehensive review of the origin, the growth, and application of Hindu civil law as a whole. This great work, though, as will be seen, not one for the general reader, forms a storehouse for the Oriental scholar and student of comparative history. Of the Rao Sahib's many contributions to the "Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society," and its Bombay Branch, of which he was (joint) honorary secretary during several years, one need not speak here, except to mention that several of these papers are reproduced in the present memorial volume. In the early seventies he rescued, republished, and edited, the transactions of "The Bombay Literary Society," containing a specially interesting account of the establishment of that body in 1804 by Sir James Mackintosh (then Recorder of Bombay) and the eminent men with whom that genial spirit was then surrounded.

His biographer remarks on, and, in some sort apologises for, the more conservative attitude which

in later years the Rao Sahib assumed towards social reform, and which, in its earlier stages, he heartily promoted. But as he believed to his very core in the divine authority of Hinduism, this change was inevitable; and, as Mr. Damodar puts it, "when the stranger, Mr. Malabari, began his crusade against Hindu marriage institutions . . . . that alienation naturally grew into active opposition." It was rather from this feeling than from any slackening in political and patriotic spirit that he held back from the Congress movement, then early in its history; though his failing strength might well excuse him in this, if apology were needed for one who knew his own mind so well. As to that patriotic instinct which—with the religious reservation just alluded to—was the dominant factor of his career, it burned brightly to the last. Apart from indications of this already given in the review, no better illustration need be sought than the following passage from his speech on the occasion of the magnificent demonstration of India's gratitude to the Marquis of Ripon, at the farewell meeting in the Bombay Town Hall, November, 1884. In presenting the address, and after alluding to the numerous deputations which combined in its testimony, he said:

"This is not an age in which the gates of Somnath can make any Viceroy famous. We have gone beyond the heroic period. We have arrived at an age of commerce and electric communications. But what connects Lord Ripon with this meeting, and the whole of India, is that telegraphic influence which moves the human heart and the human mind, and which makes one feel as if all were united by a single voice—the voice that has brought us here to-day. The mental and moral influence which is the guiding and ruling spirit of the present administration commands our sympathies, our respect, our gratitude, and our affection."

The concluding paragraphs of the memoir, in in which the tenderness as well as the strength of Vishvanath's character are sketched, comprise two or three pathetic touches—including references to his wife, a lady of true Marathi comeliness, an invalid during later years, though still young and fair, "his devotion to her never slackened"—indeed, as some of us remember, it became proverbial. The incidents at the moment of the Rao Sahib's decease are then mentioned. He had been unconscious for some hours, his medical attendants and near relatives had withdrawn to the verandah, when they were startled by a loud cry of 'Rām, Rām!'" They hastened to the couch, and found life was extinct: he

"had recovered consciousness just to cry out the name of his favourite god, as he always hoped he would be able to do . . . . his final 'Ram, Ram!' was the result of a determined will, which conquered even the physical prostration of body and brain."

Correspondence.

"THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS OF INDIA."

To the Editor of INDIA.

SIR,—As I have some claim to an opinion on the manner in which the conservancy of "the ancient monuments of India" is conducted by the responsible Government of that country, it may be of service in connexion with the question on the subject raised in the House of Commons by Sir William Wedderburn, if you will do me the favour of publishing in the columns of INDIA the following letter, written in answer to an invitation addressed to me in 1894, to sign the petition referred to in Sir William Wedderburn's question, and presented to the Secretary of State for India on the 13th of July, 1894:—

"In reply to your letter of the 5th inst. inviting me to sign a memorial to the Secretary of State for India praying that adequate and systematic provision may be made for the guardianship of the historical monuments of India, I have, with the greatest respect, to state that it is impossible for me to honestly sign the said memorial; and for the reasons fully and frankly given to the gentlemen who some time ago came to ask me for information on which to base your memorial. I should have thought that the information I then supplied would have satisfied them that no memorial was necessary.

"The Government of India have for many years undertaken not only the systematic conservation, but the systematic exposition also, of the historical monuments of India, and the former work they have carried out in the most comprehensive, detailed, and thorough manner possible, and *with unqualified success*: so that now the most scrupulous guardianship is exercised not only over all the known historical monuments of India, but over innumerable pseudo monuments of no historical character, for the guardianship of which the Government of India should not, in my humble opinion, hold themselves responsible. I am fully possessed by the enthusiasm for Art implied by your courteous and flattering appeal to me, and my interest in the architectural remains of India is a perennial source of delight to me—a recompense of heavenly price, as the Monk Theophilus says: 'retributionem cœlestis praemii'; and passing them in review, as I write, I cannot in truth and gratitude but protest that I know of no Government that takes a more intelligent, zealous, and fruitful care of the historical monuments for which it should be held to be properly responsible than the Government of India.

"I could not therefore at any time sign the proposed memorial; whilst it is quite impossible for me to do so at a moment when the Government of India is under the weightiest obligation to the patient, long-suffering people of India to consider every possible means of financial retrenchment.

"I feel that my refusal may at first seem presumptuous, seeing, from your letter, that the memorial will be signed by three most eminent ex-Secretaries of State for India; but we all know how signatures are now-a-days given blindfold in support of any plausible appeal—*i.e.*, 'accusation'—against Government; still I confess myself surprised that all these signatures are of 'My Lords.' Herodotus tells us that the Persians debated their 'burning questions' when drunk, and decided on them when sober. Tacitus tells us the same thing of the Germans, and Plato, I believe, of the Thracians, Sarmatians, Celts and Iberians. It seems, indeed, to have been a universal Aryan custom, and the germ of the division of our British Legislature into a House of Commons, or the nation drunk, and a House of Lords, or the nation sober. But what is the use of 'My Lords' if, instead of damping popular agitations, such as the present, they foment them by the enlarged imposture of their high sounding signatures?

"But this is a playful digression, and, in closing my reply, I earnestly repeat that, in my clear conviction, the Government of India not only faithfully discharge their whole duty to the historical monuments of the country, but go far beyond it, having in recent years organised a special department for their exposition; work which I feel strongly is always better done by the private citizens of a nation than under the direction of the Supreme Committee of a nation called the State.

"The great day of Indian archæological exposition was when it was left to the enthusiasm of independent scholars, and ever since it has been departmentalised it has languished.

"The only hope of reviving it is by returning to the old fashion of reliance on individual efforts, methodised, if you like, under the guidance of such learned bodies as the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, the Society of Biblical Archæology, and the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies; by which last the noblest archæological work of the rising generation of English scholars is being done. If the action of the societies you represent in the present connexion should result in some such scheme as this, it will not have been taken in vain."

The whole agitation is, in brief, as ignorant, hollow, and contemptible as could be, and the work of an irresponsible clique of the antiquarians, and the archæologers, and the palæologers, and the Royal Academicians "that are in all the realm." Sir William Wedderburn is of course in noways implicated in their action; and his question in the House of Commons last Thursday night involves, as I understand it, no support of an unwarrantable, and absolutely inequitable charge on the already overburdened revenues of India.

I have etc.

18th May, 1897. GEORGE BIRDWOOD.

The following is the text of the "ignorant, hollow and contemptible" memorial referred to:—

Memorial to the Right Hon. Henry Hartley Fowler, M.P., H.M. Principal Secretary of State for India in Council.

We beg respectfully to call your attention to a memorial presented twenty years ago to H.M. Principal Secretary of State for India in Council, by certain gentlemen interested in the history and antiquities of India, on the preservation of ancient buildings in that country.

We need not repeat what was then said as to the importance of these buildings both historically and archæologically, and we gratefully acknowledge that much has been done since that time by the Government of India for the furtherance of the objects of the memorial; much, however, still remains to be done to meet the necessities of the case and to preserve the ancient buildings of India—unrivalled for their historic and artistic interest—from the frequent depredations of tropical rains; from the overpowering effects of jungle growth, and sometimes from destruction by civil officers, railway contractors and others; and we venture to refer to the recommendations then made and apply them to the altered circumstances of the present day.

The first of the recommendations was for the classification of the different monuments in India on a defined system. That proposal the Government of India has carried out fully in the case of Bombay, the N.-W. Provinces and Oudh, while it is understood that similar valuable work is being prepared for Central India and the Central Provinces by Dr. Führer and Mr. Cousens, who in the course of their investigations have brought to light fresh treasures of ancient art and ornament, and have made plain and intelligible much that before was unknown or obscure. The lists for the Provinces of Madras, Bengal, the Punjab and the States of Rajputana, are, however, still very defective, and we would suggest the extreme importance of completing them before it is too late, and causing detailed lists of the architectural remains to be compiled for each Province under the direction of an archæological surveyor, similar to those drawn up by Dr. Führer for the N.-W. Provinces. Such volumes would be of the utmost value.

The second recommendation of the Memorial of 1873 was the employment of officers charged with the conservancy of historical monuments, whose business it would be not only to survey and catalogue the monuments most worthy of attention, but to visit them periodically, and to be responsible for the apportionment and expenditure of any grant made by Government for the purpose of keeping them in repair.

We would respectfully submit that this suggestion has not been carried out in the way intended. The execution of almost all repairs has, very naturally, been entrusted to the Public Works officers, but unfortunately, except in Bombay, the advice of the Superintendents of the Archæological Surveys has not hitherto been systematically taken. The archæological or architectural training, and the knowledge of the history, age and style of the buildings, which they possess, is necessarily of a more complete nature than can be expected from a Public Works engineer or Civil Officer.

The work requires much technical skill and experience, and for want of this, mistakes have been made and much injury unwittingly done to important monuments,[1 2] at the cost of quite unnecessarily large expenditure. In some cases a building is restored at great expense and made completely solid and permanent, but unless the restorer understands the intention of the building, and possesses some little veneration for the art it displays, the result is almost always unsatisfactory, and any interest or value which it may originally have possessed is hopelessly destroyed. While in other cases the neglect of small and inexpensive repairs at the right moment has led to lamentable ruin.[3]

† We would therefore recommend that no substantial interference with monumental remains of any kind, particularly by way of restoration, should be permitted except when the proposal has the full sanction of the Superintendent of Archæological Survey (to be appointed), through whom Collectors, Public Works officers and others should in the first place report. He should also inspect and report on all conservation works carried on.

† The third suggestion of Memorial of 1873 was that a fixed sum should be annually allocated to the conservation of buildings. We venture to substitute for this a recommendation that each Government should be asked to assign in its Public Works budget a yearly sum for inspection and conservation of buildings, to be applied only after the Archæological Surveyor has inspected the monuments, and checked or approved of the detailed estimates prepared under his instructions by the Public Works Department in each case. This would prevent injury and insure economy.

THE ROYAL ACADEMY OF ARTS.
(Signed) FREDERICK LEIGHTON, P.R.A.

THE SOCIETY OF ANTIQUARIES OF LONDON.
(Signed) A. W. FRANKS,
Pres. Soc. of Ant.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT BUILDINGS.
(Signed) WM. MORRIS, J. H. MIDDLETON, R. C. GROSVENOR — *Hon. Secs. S.P.A.B.*

THE ROYAL ARCHÆOLOGICAL INSTITUTE.
(Signed) DILLON,
Pres. Royal Archæol. Institute.

---

[1] An illustrative case occurred not long since at Byganagar, where the collector, noticing that the base of the stone car, or "Rath," in front of the Vithal Temple showed cracks and signs of decay, reported it to the Government, and the Public Works engineer being instructed to deal with it, the whole of the brick superstructure—400 years old—was at once pulled down. Thus an old and interesting memorial of the end of the fifteenth century was summarily destroyed, without reference to the Archæologist, who might at least have secured complete drawings of it, if, as a trained architect, he could not have devised some means of preserving it.

[2] We are informed that the sleeping apartments of the Great Akbar at Futtehpore Sikri form a distinct building in themselves. They possess various points of interest, amongst others a private doorway, which gave the Emperor access to his Record Office, and enabled his prime minister to visit him without public observation. An engineer was sent to Futtehpore Sikri to make some repairs, and for reasons best known to himself, built up this doorway. At the same time he built up openwork screens in another building, where blind screens had been before—and *vice versâ*—and removed a staircase from one part of a palace to another for no sufficient reason.

[3] As an instance of such a catastrophe having been averted, we give the following:—In 1891 one of the domes of the Hummum at Futtehpore Sikri had a hole in it, about the size of a cocoanut. The ceiling of the dome is covered with exquisite designs in stamped plaster work unique of their kind, and if the hole had been allowed to remain until the monsoon, the rains would have washed through it, to the further ruin of the dome, and the plaster work and designs would have been for ever lost. There is no fund at the command of the Archæological Surveyor for the repair and preservation of these buildings, and it is the duty of no one in particular to look after them. A note, however, from a stray traveller to the secretary of the department, who happened to be interested in archæology, calling his attention to the condition of the Hummum, brought a workman to the spot, with a little plaster and a piece of zinc, and for the cost of a few rupees the dome was satisfactorily repaired and the delicate plaster work preserved.

† These recommendations do not apply to *urgent* and *non-structural* repairs such as in the case described in footnote (3).

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.